MONISM OR ADVAITISM?

(An Introduction to the Advaita-philosophy read by the light of Modern Science).

BY

MANILAL NABHUBHAI DVIVEDI,

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT, SAMALDAS COLLEGE, BHAVNAGAR

Subodha Prakasha Press

BOMBAY

1889

Price Rupees two

"Every body is now looked upon as the seat of so much Energy of such and such a kind, and an endless and multifarious succession of transferences and *transmutations of such Energy makes up the history of the physical* universe".—Natural Phylosophy. Profs. Thomson and Tait.

"The philosopher will find in the theory of energy as the only real thing *in the physical universe a conception which will satisfy the utmost require*ments of a destructive Idealism, and yet give us the needed real "universal" to fill the aching void which Idealism leaves . . . Energy has risen to a position of the first importance and will yet reign alone in the physical universe —Matter and Energy B L.L.

for everything *modern*, slowly losing, I may be permitted to say without meaning any offence, all sense of respect for *antiquity* and religion; and I thought it proper to prepare the following pages in the hope that they might help them in arriving at some conclusion on a subject of such vital importance. A work* in the Vernacular, dealing with the same subject on a more comprehensive plan, is just going through the press, and it appeared necessary, to subject the main conclusions thereof to wider and more enlightend criticism, through the medium of a language which is now the *lingua franca* of nearly the whole of the world. I do not at all pretend to have done any, the smallest, justice to the subject, but I shall be amply satisfied if I succeed in interesting those who are able to think and decide for themselves.

Nadiad
7th. February 1889

M. N. D.

—:0—

* The Siddhânta Sâra.

MONISM OR ADVAITISM?

I. PRELIMINARY.

"As a purely speculative and absolutely philosophical system, which does not concern itself with the indispensable foundation of empirical facts, becomes a castle in the air, ... so on the other hand, a purely empirical system, constructed of nothing but facts, remains a disorderly heap of stones, which will never deserve the name of an edifice" —Haeckel. Hist. of Creation Vol II, p 349

The triumph of the Doctrine of Descent, or Filiation, as Prof. Haeckel appropriately calls it, has been complete in the domain of scientific research. It has brought us nearer that era in the development of human knowledge wherein philosophy and science *promise at last, to stand combined like* 'Twin-sisters,' as Prof. Huxley justly calls them, and work together, for the promotion of universal love and happiness "by a complete and honest return to Nature,........which will become possible, when man sees and understands his *true place in Nature.*" As an exclusive attention to the one leads to vague metaphysics, entire confidence on the other tends to materialism—moral materialism, as Prof. Haeckel would call it. A combination of the two is the only road to right knowledge, and right philosophy, or right science. This has been rendered to us possible by the modern theory of Monism. Prof. Haeckel, the enunciator of this view of the universe, says that Paracelsus, and long before him, Aristotle, had glimpses of this

idea; but I hope to show that the idea is as old as the world—at least as old as the hymns of the *Veda*. The Indian Yádnavalkyas, Vyásas, and S'ankaras, had not had mere glimpses of this idea, but had the full truth of it in their possession, which they have worked out into a theory—I mean Advaitism, or Monism as we shall have to call it, at once the regulator and controller of the dualistic—even polytheistic, religion of the land. Even those who ought to know better, have always relegated this theory to the limbo of vague metaphysics, or at best, called it a kind of psychological Fetishism, if I may be allowed the use of such an expression. In India itself, its numerous professors and doctors who show their skill in endless wranglings over the subtleties of the philosophy, declare, in their calm moments of unsectarian impartiality, that its real pith is now understood by a few, whereas, the mere husk of words is all that remains to them. And this result is brought about by either side looking at the philosophy, each from its own one-sided development, scientific or physical in the one, and unscientific or metaphysical in the other, thus misunderstanding and misinterpreting the true aspect of the question which is a combination of both.

It is a phenomenon, unique in the history of the world, the working of religion and science together in India. When the Dominican monk Giordano Bruno was burnt for declaring the Unity of Nature; and when long before him, the Arabian Sufi Mansur Hallaz was condemned to death by the Pope of Bagdad, the Caliph, the representative of the Great Prophet of God, for saying the same thing in the well-known phrase *An-al-Huc*; Yádnavalkya, and Vyása, and S'ankara, who said *Aham Brahma**, were, and are, to the present day, wor-

* The Sanskrta *Aham Brahm* (I am *Brahma*, subject and object combined) and the Arabic *Anal-Huc*, mean the same thing—Unity of Nature

shipped as found is of a religion at once the salvation comfort, and hope, of mankind Their philosophy still controls the whole religion,—the heterogeneous mass of sects creeds and idols of all description, of India, and the commonest boor with the rudest Fetish before him emphatically declares that salvation lies in the knowlege of *Brahma* the one God of Indian Monism, and that his Fetish is but a representation of Him, ' to Whom all homage paid, in whatever form, ever reaches*' Has the Christian missionary, with the Gospel of human brotherhood in his word, and the idea of Semitic Mono theism, a supreme Fetish again, in his heart, trying in vain to *convert this heathen boor ever cared to examine the cause of* his failure? The apparent heathen has really a higher Gospel to preach, and a higher God to worship He preaches nay practices the Gospel not of *human brotherhood*, but of *universal love* and he worships, *in his heart of hearts, and under* his rudest Fetish the Supreme God in whom subject and object are all *one* And we again ask why is it so? The answer is, that religion and science have so peacefully worked together in India *from times immemorial, that the people have* almost lost the idea of their being ever possibly distinct If you talk to them of the highest kind of Atheism, under the name of religion they will listen with all possible earnestness and zeal, if you talk *to them of the best* Religion and call it science they will dismiss you with cold indifference and *haughtiness* This again will explain why in India one finds that amasing variety of *religions*, ranging from the rankest cannibalism and epicurianism to the blindest faith in Gods of all description all doing homage to the sublime rationalism of the philosophical *Advaita* Vain words these one would

* The *Bhâgavata P rd a*

naturally exclaim; and regard these lines as but the euphuism of a vain—glorious brain to fabricate a title to greatness for the fathers of long-exploded myths. How, in the very nature of events, can it be possible for *Advaitism* or *Monism*, to exist side by side with, or even to follow from, the gross Nature-worship, or even Fetishism, as some will have it, of the *Veda?* I would only ask the reader to bear with me a few moments after first taking my assurance, that if glorifying the ancients were my object, I would never have cared to write these pages, much less to place them in his hands. I may, without presumption, add, that by a close study of the religion and philosophy of my country, as compared with the doctrines of other ancient and modern religions, I have arrived at certain conclusions which, read by the light of modern Science, appear to me full of a mine of wisdom, calling for further exploration, and promising results yet brighter, and hopes more blissful. The main conclusions on either side are the same—even the processes leading to them, nay the very names, * are the same; but there are, as there ought to be, from the long distance in time and space, several minor differences in the explanation of the laws governing the theory of Filiation which, since the latter is yet in the experimental stage, may yet find some reconciliation, nay, may receive more light, and establish the unity of the two—*Advaitism* and *Monism*. It is my firm conviction that this light, if it ever comes, will, at least in the present state of things, come from the West, and it is in the hope of getting this light that I try *imperfectly*, and even *unsuccessfully*, to lay these lines before you. If the supremacy which *ancient*

---

* *Advaitism*—non-duality, inseparability of subject and object, Unit of Nature; *Monism*—Unity of Nature, exclusion of Final causes.

Monism has ever enjoyed over the world, since times immemorial, in the form of *Mysterious Adwaitism*, *Kabbala*, and *Sufism*, can arouse the curiosity of *modern* Monism, which is not, and ought not to be, any respector of prescription, to go carefully into the minor points of difference, in its attempt to learn and teach nothing but the Truth these pages would have gained more than they deserve or desire, and the reading of history would have its lessons amply justified

To begin then with the querry—how *Adwaitism* and *Devaism** could exist together? In other words, why should this simultaneous existence of rationalistic and mythical ideas even if it can be proved, be called the working together of Science and Religion? It is now an established fact that man is a development of the animal, both *physically* and *psychologically* The distinction, however, is admitted to consist in *higher physical development*, and in *reflexive mental power* Human, as well as animal, *knowledge*, begins with sensation, and both by the very necessity of their nature, must begin with, what Tylor calls *animalising*, and Vignoli calls *entifying*, Nature Primitive man (when and where are questions foreign to our inquiry) begins with *entifying* natural objects and phenomena, and takes everything to be like himself capable of doing good or evil This leads to Fetishism With the growth of Society, in some form, grows Language, which in its development acts on the ideas of Fetishism (various *Devas*) and leads to the process of *typifying* the various different *Devas* into groups of *Devas*—*Deva* of water, *Deva* of earth and so on

---

* *Devaism* I employ this new term to imply *the kind of religion to be found in the Veda* Its prominent feature is a *variety of Devas Gods*, call it Fetishism Nature worship Kathenotheism, Monotheism or what you will What it *really* is I hope to show further on But *Devaism*, as a general term in the sense given will do to begin with

The third stage would consist, both in thought and language, of what is called Abstraction, leading to Monotheism—the idea *abstracted* from the types of *Devas.* This, it is supposed, is the highest possible ideal of religion, which the human mind is capable of. But of this hereafter. It is maintained that since all knowledge begins with sensation, and since the difference between man and animal lies in the reflexive mental power of the former, it follows that where the animal *ends* simply with *entifying,* with Fetishism; man *begins,* by the reflexive power of his mind, to review the *formation** of the *Devas,* and divesting the idea of its mythical character, to reduce it to itself *per se,* and raise, however imperfectly, a rude theory of causation which, passing through the *typifying* and *abstracting* stages, ultimately reaches to Science. So, then, myth and rationalism having a common beginning, lead to results destructive of each other, Monotheism and Science. This appears to be the result, deduced from the said premises, and corroborated by history—at least the history of the European and Semitic races in general. Whether this antagonism is a necessity of the natural function of the intellect of man, or whether it is brought about simply by the Indo-Aryan instinct of Europe, accepting blindly the Semitic idea of God, will transpire immediately from what we are about; but let us take it as admitted at the beginning, that the Religious and Scientific faculties do co-exist in man, and that the difference between him and the animal consists in the reflexive power of his mind

Though we may grant that religion, or rather knowledge, begins necessarily with Fetishism, we cannot so readily grant, that the *Vedic* hymns, the oldest record of the early History

* The process and instrument of *forming*

of Human Thought consist of a worship of mere Fetishes, *Devas* When the *Rishis* extol *one god after another*, as the Supreme the Governor the Lord and emphatically and repeatedly declare that all Gods are but *expressions* of the *One Ens**, passing into so many shapes how can we call their worship pure Fetishism? Is it Monotheism? It may be, but then there are the so many *Devas*, and besides, Monotheism as Semitic Monotheists understand it, cannot be the primitive state of religion The *Devas* however need not puzzle us since they are mere *terms* of *expressing* the Supreme Ens As to Monotheism being the highest development of religious thought I maintain that Semitic Monotheism is not and cannot be the highest development of religious thought but Aryan monotheism can be, and is such The idea can be Monotheistic at any at least at an early stage of development but the difference, the last stage will always lie in the way in which his Monotheism is understood The Lord God may be a grand architect of Nature and her destinies or may be but Nature itself one unique and whole In either case it will be Monotheism but the difference will be vast and important Before appealing to facts let us appeal to the hypothesis with which we started The psychological part of man consists of two parts the animal and the human, the former giving sensation and leading to Fetishism and Mythology the latter—the reflexive mental capacity—leading to Rationalism and Science The perfection of the animal mind will rest in a highly finished Fetish *without* itself the perfection of the human mind will rest in that unifying of Nature from *within* itself in which all—subject and object—is *one* The former is Semitic Monotheism

---

* *Ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti —Rig Veda* One only Ens the sages declare in manifold ways

or God, as popularly understood; the latter is Aryan Monotheism, or *Brahma*, the *Advaita*, as philosophically proved. Monotheism as God *the Supreme*, must and will stand opposed to science and progress; Monotheism as *Brahma the one*, must lead to progress, by regulating and controlling religion. The *man* must rule the *animal*, even psychologically; and Science and Religion ought, as in ancient India, to go hand in hand. The revolt of European Science against Religion, is only a revolt of the Indo-Aryan instinct against the Semitic idea of God; it is only an attempt to mend a historical error*, not a necessity of the human mind which, as shown above, tends all the other way, and of which the contest itself is ample evidence. Thus, then, by the very hypothesis, there is no thing at all improbable in allowing the *Vedic* religion to be at once Monotheistic and Polytheistic; the Monotheistic gaining mastery over the Polytheistic in the end. Even in the primitive hymns we already detect traces of this Monotheism,† which ultimately becomes formulated in the *Upanis'ads*, records as old as the *Veda*. The two ideas, the Religious and the Scientific, which derive their origin from the same source, thus co-exist, and working their way peacefully together, end by setting up the latter as the Religion of Humanity. Thus *Advaitism*, or *Vedánta*, as it is popularly called—it being the *anta*, the *last Truth* taught by the *Veda*,—is the religion of enlightened India, since times immemorial; and even superstitious Religion which must continue to please the masses, never fails to pay homage to it by always regarding salvation possible only after a true knowledge of it. Right, human, *Aryan*, Monotheism ought to be none other

* The acceptance of Semitic Christianity by European *Aryans*.

† The *Purus'a Sukta*; the hymns to *Prajâpati* and *Hiranyagarbha* &c.,- *Rgveda*.

than this Religio-Scientific idea of the *Advaita.* The *Jnána-márga, i. e.,* the path of *science* or scientific religion—call it what you will, for it is hard to separate the two in the Indian idea of *Advaitism*—is to the *Aryan Hindu the Religion par excellence;* the *Karma-márga, i. e.,* the path of *worshipping* his Supreme God, is to him only *a way to prepare himself for the former.* Thus we perceive at once by the necessities of logic and the corroboration of history, that *Advaitism* is a fact as old as the world; that it is a result of the combination of Religion and Science; and lastly, that it is the true, rational, and scientific, Monotheism which man as man ought to arrive at.

II. MONISM.

"Matter can never exist and be active without mind, nor can mind without matter."—GOETHE. (*Haeckel's Hist. of Creation.*)

We have seen the possibility, logical necessity, and historical existence of a theory of belief in which science and religion stand combined,—Aryan Monotheism which hence-forward we shall call *Advaitism,* to distinguish it from Semit ic Monotheism. It is however, very important after this preliminary outline of the necessities of mental development, to explain what *Advaitism* really means, and why we propose to call it, Indian Monism or Monism. But the word Monism, in my opinion, calls for explanation before *Advaitism.* It is impossible to convey to the reader even the barest outline of this great theory in all its bearing and importance in an introduction like this; but we may hope to form some general idea from an enumeration of its main features.

With the growth of what is called Natural Science in Europe, all Nature came to be divided into two main classes—Organic (forms having what we understand as *life*), and Inorganic (forms having no *life*). The question then was, and even now is, how these two came into existence? There was the old Mosaic theory to suggest that they were *created* by an extra-cosmic God who breathed his own essence in some of these, and called forth living forms out of dust. This theory of creation was, for a long time, accepted to explain the origin of *life*. With this theory at their back, scientists began their investigation of Organic Nature, and arrived at certain well-defined results in Biology—Botany and Zoology. About the beginning of the 18th century, Linnæus rendered great service to the science of Biology by what is known as the "*binary nomenclature*" of plants and animals. He arranged all organic forms into species, genera, orders, and classes. But just at this important point he imported into science the supernatural idea of creation. He, and with him many scientists, admitted that all the individuals of a species can be developments of *one primary form*; but the same cannot be asserted of all species, much less of all genera, or all orders, or all classes. Each individual species was a distinct act of creation. He was followed by Cuvier who, about the end of the 18th century, exercised the greatest influence on the study of Zoology, and founded the very important science of Comparative Anatomy. He divided all animals into Vertebrate, Articulate, Molluscous, and Radiate animals; but not being able to discern the right cause of the distinction between these four classes, he did not go beyond the Linnæan idea of the *creation* of individual species. Next to Zoology, Cuvier rendered the greatest service to the science of Petrefactions or Palæonto-

logy. The remains and impressions of extinct animals and plants in the different geological strata of the earth, are so many records of the history of the ancient progenitors of our race, and point most conclusively to the theory of development. But Cuvier thought that the presence of these fossils in different strata of the earth, separated from one another by enormous periods of time, were the results of certain periodic cataclysms, after each of which, all species of plants and animals were *created* anew. This theory led to the idea of geological periods with plants and animals peculiar to each. So far, we have seen that the question at issue turns on the origin of species which all scientists regarded as *the result of special acts of creation.* This is the supernatural, or teleological, or dualistic, theory of the universe, which has received its death-blow, quite recently, at the hand of the non-supernatural, mechanical, or monistic theory of development.

In the time of Cuvier, the French naturalist Lamark published his "Philosophie Zoologique" (1809), 'and clearly set forth the theory of the connected development of all plants and animals, in all periods and ages, from a few simple types capable of multiplying themselves by what is called 'spontaneous generation.' Though preceeded by many German naturalists like Goethe, Bar, Büch, Schaaffhausen and others, Lamark is generally considered the first enunciator of the theory of Descent, or Filiation (of the different species), with all the general laws governing it——Inheritance and Adaptation. But neither Lamark, nor many others who followed him, from 1809 to 1859, were able to satisfactorily explain "the transformation of species by the true demonstration of its mechanical antecedents." The special merit of having found out the solution of this problem, belongs to the English naturalist Charles Dar-

win who in his Theory of Natural Selection or the Struggle for Existence, first set forth the clear mechanical causes of the "transformation of species" by the laws of Inheritance and Adaptation. Much about the same time (1858) as the publication (1859) of Darwin's great work, Alfred Wallace had independently arrived at the same conclusions. Thus, by the labours of Lamark, Darwin, and many other naturalists, all organic forms were deduced from one primary form, capable of multiplying itself by spontaneous generation, and leading to the formation of tribes (Philogeny) and individuals (Ontogeny) by purely mechanical causes.

Just the same result was achieved in the Inorganic department of Nature, by the German philosopher Kant (1755) who propounded his theory of the development of the various solar systems of the Universe, from one primary mass. This is the well-known Gas Theory which has not yet been replaced by a better one; but which has, on the other hand, been fully established by the French mathematician Laplace, and the English astronomer Herschel. The theory of Descent thus set forth by Kant and Lamark, did not gain general acceptance till 1859 when, Charles Darwin published his Theory of Natural Selection. The ground, however, had already been prepared by another English naturalist Charles Lyell whose "Principles of Geology" (1830) completely reformed the science, and refuted the theory of "periodic cataclysms" of Cuvier, by showing that the formation of the earth's crust was *one continued development* extending over *immeasurably* long periods of time.

The unity of Organic and Inorganic Nature, each in its own department, being thus established, the next step was to demonstrate the possibility of Organic development from In-

organic forms. Here, indeed, is a gulf which is not yet completely bridged over, but which scientists regard not as entirely impassable. The celebrated Carbon Theory reducing all the facts which distinguish Organic from Inorganic forms to mere chemical arrangement, promises to supply the gap. Experiments also have been brought forth to show the chemical development of certain Organic phenomena from Inorganic substances, and in the hope that we shall some day be able to produce chemically what is generally called *life*, the distinction between Inorganic and Organic Nature is assumed to be nil. Inorganic forms develop, by spontaneous generation, as illustrated in the Monera, those simplest "organisms without organs," into Organic forms, and the Unity of Nature is held to be complete.

Nor should it be supposed that this theory leaves out of consideration the phenomena of the mind and soul of man. It establishes by a series of experiments, on men and animals, in all conditions of development, that what is ordinarily known as the mind and soul of man is, in no way, a special property of his organism ; but it is only a development from lower animal stages, subject to the very laws which govern the development of his *form*. It is maintained that sensation, will, and thought, the attributes of the human soul, are mere developments from lower forms ; and that therefore, the human will as such, being subject to the general laws of Inheritance and Adaptation, is never really *free*. So, then, this Scientific Philosophy, so to speak, explains by causes *purely mechanical* (efficient causes), the *whole of the phenomena of this Universe* from *one* primordial *substance* (matter) and its *inherent capabilities* (Force &c. not supposed to exist apart from matter, as is hitherto done by materialists), thus setting aside the supernatural theory of

the Universe based on the action of certain *causes working with a set purpose* (final causes). This is *Monism*—"Monistic Science or the Science of Nature"—based on the "closest interaction and the reciprocal penetration of philosophy and empirical knowledge." *

III. ADVAITISM.

"Nature has neither Kernel nor shell,
It is she that is All and All at once.";—Goethe (Hist. of Creation.)

We now turn to *Advaitism*, the philosophy of the *Advaita*. In arriving at a true conception of the elements of this philosophy, we shall follow rather more closely the method adopted in tracing the outlines of Monism. Though a history of Indian philosophy, from a chronological stand-point, is next to impossible, at least at present, it is possible to trace signs of some historical connection between the different systems of thought, from their individual mode of development. The well-known schools of philosophy, systems of thought, or *Dars'anas* (*right seeing, right knowledge*), are six in number; and *Advaitism* appears to be the last in the order of development, and the first in the order of merit and importance. Again, the *Darsánas* are scarcely independent systems of thought, as we understand the term, but they are each and all attempts at a correct reading of the text of the *Upanis'ads*—the principal and important complement of the *Veda*—and are therefore always governed by them. For both these reasons it becomes necessary first, to deter-

* Haeckel's History of Creation Vol. II, page 340 The rough sketch of Monism, given here, is taken from the History of Creation which must be read by every one, laying even the smallest claim to a scientific or philosophic training.

mine the place of *Advaitism* in the history of the *Vedic religion* in general, and then, to trace its development from the *Dars'anas* in particular.

We have already seen that even under the Kathenotheism, as Prof Max Muller calls it, of the *Veda*, there runs a vein of rationalism, frequently bursting out in questions about the origin of things, about the nature of the Being that *was* "when there was neither Entity nor Nonentity,*" about Him "whom they should worship," about the *Purusa* "whose members are the universe, and who sacrificing himself produced the *Veda* and everything besides" As, gradually, *Vedic* worship developed itself into a system of *Yadnas* and formal ceremonies, which assumed a definite form in the *Bráhmanas*† and the *A'ranyakas*, the latent rationalism of the later hymns crystallized itself in the *Upanis ads* Naturally enough, the *Upanis'ads* divested the *Devas* of the *Veda* and the *Brahmaṇas*, of their power and form, by emphatically declaring that they were powerless in securing the highest bliss to their worshippers, and that the true way to eternal bliss, lay through Knowledge, and not Formalism The *Upanis'ads*, discussing the origin of things and the origin of evil, *determined that everything emanates from one substance which is Brahman* (from the root *Brh* to grow—hence *Brahman* is something that has grown, grown so great as to unify all, matter and spirit, subject and object, in one), ‡ ever incomprehensible, but all Existence (*Sat*), Intelligence (*Chit*), and Bliss (*A'nanda*) There is no evil in the *nature* of *things*

---

* *Rgveda*

† This term is used throughout, not for the sacerdotal class bearing that name, but for books of that name

‡ This unity of Nature is expressed by yet another term, *A'tman*, the living existing thinking, *self*

(Brahman); but only in the way in which the mind of man perverts it. The Reality which, being indescribable, is always mentioned in the *Upanis'ads* as *It (Tat)*, is *Brahman*: material manifestations being but shadows of the Eternal Ens clothed in *name* and *form (máyá*—illusion*)*. "All misery consists in a sense of separateness; there is all bliss in the *Bhumá, non-separateness, identity of subject and object, recognition of the Unity of Nature, Brahman*."* The way to this bliss lies through *knowledge* and knowledge alone and "indeed, he who knows *One* knows *All*."† No evil can there be in Unity, for "where all has become One Self, who should see whom (and) by what instrument? All misery lies in variety, in duality." ‡ This is the main idea of the *Upanis̀ads*—at least these are the questions which the *Ṛs̀is* propose to themselves. All the later *Dars'anas*, even all sectarian mythological religions, draw inspiration from this source, and interpret the texts of these books, each after their own, often pre-conceived theory. So strong, however, is the hold of this rationalistic religion over the national mind that any religion independent of *Brahman*, is, to the present day, instantly hooted out as Atheism or Materialism.

The *Vedic* period was followed by the *Bráhmaṇa* period which again was followed by the *Sutra* period, in which the cumbrous formalism of the *Bráhmaṇas* was reduced to certain mnemonic aphorisms *(sutras)*, ‡ and in which the derivation of a large number of easy ceremonies from the *Veda* was rendered necessary by the growing necessities of extensive dominion, and the formation of different orders *(Varṇa)*. These also, are

* *Chhándogya.*

† *Chhándogya.* ‡ *Bṛhadáranyaka.*

‡ Called *S'rauta* or *Kalpa Sutras.*

embodied in *Sutras** which are supplemented by numerous treatises called *Smrtis*, explaining the same thing together with duties of the four *Varnas*, and the laws of *Dharma* (religion and right conduct) leading to *Moksa* (Eternal bliss) In this period, the philosophy of the *Upanisads* also was reduced to certain set *Sutras†* attributed generally to Vyâsa and divided into four Books of four Chapters each treating of the consensus of all *Upanisads* (Book I) and all *Smrtis* (Book II ch I) *in declaring Brahma‡ to be the supreme Ens*, of the tendency of all Reasoning also to the same end (Book II ch. II), of the way to acquire the knowledge of *Brahma* (Book II chh III—IV and Book III), and of the nature of *Moksa* or Supreme bliss (Book IV) These *Sutras*, together with the principal§ *Upanisads*, and the *Bhagvad Gita* a portion of the oldest epic *Mahâ Bhârata* form what are called, the *Prasthana traya*, the three stays (of religion) which every new preacher must explain in consistency with one another, and with the system he intends to develop from them Hence all *Darsanas*, for which a way is thus prepared are chiefly governed in their inquiry by the text of the *Upanisads* and the *Sutras*, and it cannot therefore be said with certainty whether they historically followed one after the other, or, which is more probable, obtained simultaneous acceptance each within its own

* *Grhya Sutras and Dharma Sutras* † *Brahma Sutras or Sarira Sutras or Uttara Mimansa Sutras*

‡ This is only the nom native singular of *Brahman* neut which must be distinguished from *Brahma* the nom sing of *Brahman* masc meaning the particular God of that name.

§ Ten in number though the whole number of these treatises known up to date is nearly 250 The ten are *Chhandogya Brhadaranyaka Isa Kena Katha Prasna Mundaka Mandukya Aitareya* and *Taittiriya* Sankara has written commentaries on all these

circle. We shall, however, see that the circle of *Advaitism* finally overlaps all others, and stands last in the order of development, but first in the limit it sets to all subsequent religions. In explaining the meaning of *Advaitism* we shall mainly rely on the *Upaniśads*, the *Sutras*, and the *Gitá*, as explained by S'ankara—the great and first exponent of *Advaitism* through his commentaries on them. The formalism of the *Bráhmaṇas, Sutras**, and *Smṛtis*, had become too cumbrous for ordinary men, and had, above all, created invidious distinctions by denying admission to the S'udras in the cult reared by them. These circumstances naturally led to schisms headed by Chârvâka, Buddha, and Jina†—the first a materialist out and out; the other two firm repudiators of the prevalent formalism, and preachers of universal brotherhood and universal salvation: the one by his religion of *Nirvána*, the other by his very noble creed of *Ahimsá*. This spirit of Agonsticism, gave a last blow to the animal-sacrifices (*Yadnas*) of the *Veda*, and compelled the *Ṛśis* to preach with less sectarianism, and great disinctness and emphasis, the *knowledge-religion* (*dnána-márga*) of the *Upaniśads*, in supersession of the *form-religion* (*Karma-márga*) of the *Veda* and the *Bráhmaṇas*. The latter was, henceforward, useful only as a means to the former—the real "end and aim of the existence of man as man‡ S'ankara, the great exponent of this universal religion, is supposed to have lived in about the 8th. century A. D.; and though we take him to be our chief guide, several interpreters §, quite

* The *Grhya*-and *Kalpa Sutras*, not the *Brahma-Sutras*.

† Pray do not forget that we are dealing only with the development of thought, and not with the chronological appearance of these systems.

‡ *Vivekachudámani*.

§ Their works are unfortunately lost to us.

as powerful, appear to have preceded him, exactly at the proper moment in the course of religious development.

Having thus determined the place of *Advaitism* in the development of religious or rather rational thought in general, let us trace its development from the *Darsanas* in particular. To this end, a brief survey of the *Darsanas* is necessary. Let us begin with the system of Gautama for it is pre eminently the system of Inference—*Nyáya**—and as such less governed by the *Veda*, and therefore, taking the initiative in a line of Inductive inquiry completed by Kanâda reformed by Kapila, enlarged by Patanjali, and finally settled by Vyasa and Sankara. All the same, Gautama begins, as by the tradition of his caste and country he must, with the aphorism "As Eternal bliss in the form of complete and ultimate cessation of pain is possible only after a knowledge of the Truth" this ought to be investigated by the sixteen *Padárthas*†, categories (rather objects and rules of inquiry) *Pramána* (instrument of knowledge, proof), *Prameya* (the thing to be proved), *Samsaya* (doubt), *Prayojana* (motive) *Drstánta* (instance to corroborate generalisations from Induction) *Siddhánta* (the opinion professed), *Avayava* (the members of the syllogism) *Tarka* (confutation), *Nirnaya* (right knowledge of the case) *Váda* (discussion) *Jalpa* (mere wrangling whether on this side or that) *Vitanda* (random arguing without establishing anything on one's side), *Hetvábhása* (fallacy) *Chhala* (the use of ambiguities to entrap) *Játi*

---

* *Nyaya* means *Pararthánumána* inference with the five members to convince an opponent of the truth of our *previously acquired conviction* i e, *Svarthánumána*, inference for knowing the truth by oneself, which does not consist of five members

† In my opinion, the word *Padártha* category, head of predicable is wrongly applied to the sixteen *heads of inquiry* laid down by Gautama

(an argument that destroys itself), and *Nigrahasthâna* (entrapping the opponent). It will readily be seen that all this belongs to Metaphysics or Logic proper, and we have, therefore, nothing very important to note, but the important fact that this philosophy believes in the existence of a Supreme creator (*Iśvara*) as demonstrated by inference—by the well-known argument from design, and, also, in the implicit authoritativeness of His word (the *Veda*). The soul of man is to work its way to Eternal bliss (*Mokśa*), which is final cessation of pain, by finding out the truth, through the *favour* of this *Iśvara*. We pass on next to Kaṇâda who completed the work of Gautama. He dived deeper into the truth (*tattva*) which Gautama hoped to find by simple inference and observation: and obtained by a careful analysis of nature, facts which we may call scientific, at least in that age of *Vedic i. e.* religious orthodoxy. His school of philosophy is known as the *Vaiśeśika*, from his observing the *Viśeśa* (specific) and *Sâmânya* (generic) properties of objects, and arranging them in species and genera. He began by observing the generic (*sâmânya*) properties of things, and found that the first great division, under which all *padârthas* (objects) can be arranged, is *Dravya* (substance)—*that which subsists*, is cognised by the senses. At the same time he was conscious of the fact that it is impossible to know substance *per se*, but through some one or more of its properties, or modes of action. Hence, after substance which he took to be the *substratum* of some property or action, he postulated two other categories or *padârthas*—*Guna* (property), and *Karma* (action). He further argued that inasmuch as these three are the only things capable of being, to some extent, conceived as independent existences, and at the same time existing in and through one another, there must be a generic mark

running through them all. This is *Sâmânya*—generic mark of things. It is the fourth *padârtha*. But though the first three *padârthas* are capable of being placed under a genus, they are still seperate by virtue of certain specific properties which are not capable of being placed under a genus, being but a group of unlikes, and which, therefore, ought to be called a *padârtha*. This is *Viśeśa* (differentia)—the fifth *padârtha*. Again, if Substhnce cannot exit but through Property or Action, and *vice versa*; and if these three *padârthas* derived their generic and specific character through the fourth, and the fifth respectively; it is necessary to understand the relation between them all. This is called *Samavâya* (intimate or inseparable relation). But if these six are the only *padârthas*, where are *darkness*, *similarity* etc, recognised as *padârthas* by other schools, to be placed? Similarity ect, are disposed of under Generic mark ect.; but darkness continued to present a difficulty, to explain which, Kanâda or rather his interpreters, added a seventh* *padârtha*—*Abhâva* (non-existence) of any of the six (which are *Bhâvas*). These are the seven *Vaiśeśika padârthas*, by enumerating (*uddeśa*), defining (*lakśana*), and justifying (*parikśâ*) which, Kanâda finishes the inquiry which he has begun, of course, in the usual manner, "To escape from pain, which escape is possible only after proper reflection proceeding from Inference, which, again, is dependent on Induction (*Vyâpti*) for the purpose of carrying which on, the six (seven) *padârthas* must be known."† The sixteen points of discussion proposed by Gautama are shown to be included in these seven. *Dravyas* (substances) are nine: *Prthvi* (the substratum chiefly of the pro-

* In the *Sutras* he begins with six *padârthas* only

† *Vaiśeśika-Sutra*

perty of smell), *Jala* (the substratum of coldness), *Tejas* (the substratum of heat and light), *Váyu*(the formless substratum of touch) and *A'kâśa* (the substratum of sound), *Kála* (the cause of time as generally understood), *Dig* (space), *A'tman* (the substratum of knowledge), *Manas* (the atomic feeler of happiness and misery). Of these nine, the first four are eternal as well as non-eternal—eternal in their atomic state, and non-eternal in their aggregate condition. Hence they are called " formative, substances" — substances of which all things are made. The other five are eternAl and all-pervading, except *Manas* which, though eternal, cannot be all-pervading, being only atomic. The theory of eternal invisible final atoms as the material cause of the universe is first enunciated by Kaṇâda. *A'tman* (soul) the eighth substance, is of two kinds—*Iśvara* and *Jiva*(supreme,and individual soul), the former *one*, the latter *many*. By the will of God(*Iśvara*) the atoms begin to move, and form the universe with all its diversities. The soul of man (*jiva*) in consatant union with *manas* which retains, even after death, the impressions of actions done, is dragged through a series of births, till by devotion to the Supreme God, final cessation of pain is obtained. These are some of the important facts we should bear in mind for the porpose of our inquiry. The rest of this philosophy, though very important, may be disposed off in a few words The second *padártha*—*Guṇa*—is devided into 24 kinds which, along with Form, Taste, Smell, Touch, Sound, includes Number, Intelligence, Hapiness, Misery, etc. Of these, Intelligence (*Buddhi*) *is defined as that function of the mind* which is present in the form of the consciousness of anything. It may be either direct experience, or remembrance. The former may be right or wrong. Under right experience are

discussed some of the most important questions in inductive, and deductive Logic, with a minuteness not in my opinion, surpassed even by the advanced thinkers of the present century. The instruments of right knowledge are four Perception, Inference, Analogy, and Testimony By the last, this system admits the authority of the *Veda*—it being based on the most reliable Testimony, the word of God whose existence they establish by inference from design The third *padartha*—*Karma*—is of five kinds, whereas the fourth—*Samánya*—which is one, eternal, and common to objects more than one—is of two kinds the Supreme (*Satta*), and the Subordinate (*i e* the common property *of any Genus subordinate to the Supreme Genus) Satta* is, as it were, the *Summum* Genus found only in *Dravya Guna*, and *Karma*, for, these alone are capable of being arranged into species and genera, on account of their being many, and possessing specific and generic marks The other *padarthas* can have no *Sámánya* (Genus) and, therefore, no *Satta*.* *Viseshas*, the fifth *padartha*, to be found in the atoms of the first four of the nine substances, and in the very form of the other five, are endless in number The sixth—*Samavaya*, wherever found, is the same, and is, therefore one The last—*Abháva is of four kinds* anterior, ulterior mutual, and absolute

Not satisfied with this division of Nature into seven categories Kapila thought of subverting it altogether He began by examining whether the various species of each of these

* Vide *Udyanacharya, Kusumanjali* where he rules that ' when the objects are not really more than one, when they are names of the same thing, when confusion arises when the definition of the thing is violated, when there is a *regressus ad infinitum*, and when the necessary relation does not obtain, no *Sámánya* (Genus) can be established

genera were really 'good' species, or capable of being reduced to a yet smaller number. In fact he questioned the very existence of *Sattá* (the *summum Genus*) as a *padártha*, and determined that the real, inconvertible, irreducible, *Sattá* was *Prakṛti* (matter, *dead matter* as it is called—the *prima matrix*), all the other *padárthas* being derivable from it, by the spontaneous differentiation of its three inherent properties—*Sattva* (passiveness), *Rajas* (restlessness), *Tamas* (grossness).* But, all the same, *dead* matter was, and is, never known to produce *life*, and Kapila entirely unwilling to introduce a creator in his theory of the cosmos, naturally sought explanation in a *Puruśa* (soul)—always *in*, but not *of*, *Prakrti*. *Puruśa* can never *create*, *Prakṛti* can never *move*; the one lame, the other blind. The cripple and the blind work together for the benefit of the cripple, which benefit (*mokśa*) consists in attaining to the stage of *passiveness* (*Sattva*)—the inherent property of the blind (*prakrti*). *Puruśa* being bound in *Prakṛti*, believes himself to be miserable, happy ect; whereas after exactly understanding the real *Sattvaguṇa*, by the destruction of *Karma* (action, the result of *Rajas* and *Tamas*), *Prakṛti* ceases to affect him. *Puruśas* are eternal and many; and for every *Puruśa* who is thus enlightened, *Prakṛti* ceases to act; in other words, *the course of nature rightly understood leads to no misery*. The *action* of *Prakṛti* is *for Puruśa*, but not *of Puruśa*, like that of milk in the cow *for* the calf which being nourished, it ceases to flow. *Prakṛti* thus acts by *spontaneous action*, being influenced, so to speak, by *Puruśa*, in the same manner as "iron drawn to the magnet."† Thus *Kapila* was the first who freed him-

* *Prakṛti* is generally defined as the equilibrium of the three properties: *Trigunasámyávasthá*. It is called *Pradhána* as well.

† The cause which produces differentiation, spontaneous action, in *Prakṛti* is its own property *Rajas*.

self from the trammels of orthodoxy, and scouting away all teleological explanations of the universe, tried to build a theory on the purely mechanical action of Nature. His faith in the authority of the *Veda* was but slender for to him it was not the word of God who in his theory did not exist. However, he makes free use of texts which can be brought to bear on his theory. We can easily perceive that this is a plain attempt to introduce the theory of mechanical development in the domain of Indian Rationalism, and it would be interesting to take a cursory view of the stages of development through which *Prakṛti* works. Kapila calls *Prakṛti*, the original *Prakṛti—Mulaprakṛti* it being no *vikṛti* (evolute) of any thing, and there being many evolutes from it. *Puruṣa* is neither *prakṛti* nor *vikṛti*. In explaining the nature of *Prakṛti*, and in defining the great revolution he was going thereby to introduce in Science, Kapila tries to refute the teleological theory of Kaṇāda by saying that when for every genus and its individuals the *Vaiśeṣika* requires the entirely superfluous idea of special acts of creation—without understanding that no *creation* can call into being that which does not exist in the *nature* of the original thing.* *Prakṛti* with its potentialities is enough to account for everything.† *Mula prakṛti* is capable of *evolving* several Elements out of itself. These are seven in number. These seven which are *vikṛtis* (evolutes) of *Prakṛti* are again the *prakṛti* (original cause) of sixteen others which are *vikṛtis* (evolutes) only, being incapable of becoming the *prakṛti* (cause) of any further Ele-

---

* This is the theory usually expressed as non existence (*asat*) producing existence (*sat*).

† This is the theory of Ens (*sat*) coming out of Ens (*sat*) opposed to the previous one. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*.

ment. In fact, the 23 elements thus evolved stand much in the same relation to *Mula-prakṛti*, as the 65 elements of chemical science to matter in general. It is, therefore, the same thing to say that this philosophy recognises only two elements, or twenty-five elements. From *Prakṛti* is evolved *Mahat* (cognisability),* from *Mahat Ahankára* (Individualisation). *Ahankára* from its inherited *Tamas* side, so to speak, produces the five *Tanmátras* (elemental properties in a fine state).† From the *Tanmátras* evolve the five substances—*Pṛthivi*, *Jala*, *Tejas*, *Váyu* and *A'kása*; as from the *Sáttvika* side of *Ahankára* evolve the eleven *avenues* of *intercourse*, the five organs of action: *Karmendriya* (hands, feet etc.), the five organs of perception: *Dnánendriya* (eye, ear etc.), and the organ of knowledge (mind) consisting of these two.‡ As these are the only elements, single substances, not reducible the one into the other, and as all others that can by still continuing the division be placed under each of them are mere compounds the division cannot logically proceed further. Thus, this theory of *Puruṣa*, and *Prakṛti* (divided into 23 elementary substances) is the first rational attempt at a mechanical explanation of the Universe, containing faint glimpses of the doctrine of Descent in its theory of evolutes. It will be readily

---

* As of objects by their dimension etc. arising from primary differentiation in the cosmical substance. The next evolute Individuality also, must be similarly understood. These two words *Mahat* and *Ahankára* are often rendered as Intelligence and Egoism.

seen, on careful comparison, that it entirely reforms the *Padarthas* of Kanada and deduces them from their real scientific source—the spontaneous action of Nature with her potentialities Though this philosophy has made a real advance in science it is still *dualistic* in its conception of the two original causes and the 23 evolutes It is reserved for *Adwaitism* to make it *monistic*, by showing that the original two are but *one*, and the 23 evolutes are not simple elements Of this however further on This is the *Sánkya*,* or the Theory of the *Enumeration* (*Sankyá*) of elements

The atheism of the *Sankya* did not however satisfy Patanjali who subscribing in toto to the theory in general and even making certain very important practical additions to it, superposed the idea of an *Isvara* through whose *grace* alone was right knowledge and Eternal bliss possible to the *Purusa* He maintained that *Purusa* ever immersed in *Prakrti* can never find his way to salvation, but through the guidance of a higher Intelligence which is *Isvara* self existent and self manifest His system is called the *Yoga* the way to get rid of the cause of all misery—the wandering mind—and be in union (*Yoga*) with the Supreme His philosophy is highly practical and concerns itself, not with the evolution of the universe, but exclusively with an examination and regulation of the human organism in a manner to secure Eternal bliss— freedom from the bonds of *Prakrti* In a sense, therefore for purposes of meditation etc which form the chief means of acquiring tranquillity it was necessary for Patanjali to postulate the existence of a Supreme guide for

* Curiously enough this very word having the meaning given is used in the *Bhagvad Gitá* to mean *knowledge of the truth* Indeed *real knowledge is rat onalistic (Sánkya)* !

the ignorant *Puruśa*. With the aim of securing that natural regulation of the human body and mind which would conduce to health happiness and final eternal joy, he applied himself solely to the study of those laws of nature which directly concern, not the formation, but the action of the human organism. Though this theory would for this very reason, be useful, in a sense, for an explanation of the laws of Descent, as understood by Indian philosophy, to go at any length into its details in this place is not necessary: the more so, when all that goes under the name of *Yoga* is usually dismissed as mere rubbish got up by religious superstition in the foolish hope of getting happiness by mortifications of the flesh. I hold, however, that the theory of *Yoga* is perfectly natural,* and deserves the name of science, though in a limited sense, and just for curiosity if not for edification, I would recommened it to the consideration of the thoughtful reader. I shall try to explain its bearing on the history of *Advaitism*, in its relation to the law of *Karma*, later on. To be as brief as possible let us at once begin with the eight divisions of *Yoga—Yama, Niyama, A'sana, Prâṇâyáma, Pratyáhára, Dhâraṇâ, Dhyâna, Samâdhi*. The first two treat of the rules of diet, conduct, and ways of thought, which an aspirant to true knowledge must adopt. The third carefully describes several *postures* suitable to a proper *regulation of breath*—the main topic of consideration. *Regulation of breath* is *Prâṇâyáma*, the road to health and happiness. Here is incidentally examined the whole theory of creation, and it is shown that the sun is the

---

* The oft-quoted, because highly authentic, instance of the *Sâdhu* of Ranjit Sinh, who lay in a state of trance under the ground, for 40 days without food or drink of any kind, is convincing proof of the practical facts of this science.

great reservoir of *Prâṇa* or vitality, which is distributed throughout the universe by way of currents in the all-pervading *A'kâśa* (Ether). The *Prâṇa*, or breath of the human organism, is a part of this universal vital principle. The moon also is shown to have its share in nourishing all organic matter, and in regulating the ebb and flow of the *Prâṇa* of nature. With every phase of the moon the *Prâṇa* of man changes its course. These changes, minutely observed, establish the fact that the breath of the human organism changes from right to left, * and *vice versâ* every two hours. In these two hours each of the five *tattvas*, which we have seen in the *Sânkhya*, obtain their course. The health of the human organism depends on a proper equilibrium of these *tattvas*, and on the proper flow of *prâṇa*. If this balance be disturbed by nourishment, conduct, or thought, discordant to the prevailing *prâṇa* and *tattva*, the course of nature will be reversed, and disease, uneasiness, misery, will be the consequence. The theory of the currents of *prâṇa* is further developed to explain the theory of *moksha*, and *transmigration* also, by purely mechanical causes, but this we reserve for future consideration With the proper *prâṇa* and proper *tattva*, at any given moment, the aspirant after knowledge must begin the practice of *Prâṇâyâma* *Prâṇâyâma* consists chiefly in different modes of inhaling retaining, and exhaling the breath, which, when perfectly mastered, are capable of producing entire conformity with the laws of nature, both physical and psychological The next step is

* As indicated by its flow through one or the other aperture of the nose. The flowing through the right nostril is called the Sun, it being *positive*, the flowing through the left is called the Moon, it being *negative*—vitalising and nourishing being looked upon by Patanjali as positive and negative processes

Pratyáhára, which is a complete control over the wanderings of the mind by regulating the *práṇa*—its channel of communication with external nature. Then follows *Dháraṇá*, complete fixity of the mind on any subjective or objective centre, accompanied with *Práṇáyáma*. Here are described incidentally the nervous system of the human organism, the various plexuses* of nerves and ganglia, the position and functions of the spinal cord and brain, and the modes of carrying the *práṇa* through all these, with a view to obtain complete mastery over the laws governing the organism. Then follows *Dhyána* or meditation, leading to *Samádhi* or complete absorption in the eternal self † the living, ever-blissful, sustainer of all. The *Yogi* who has reached this stage, has acquired powers generally called miraculous—such as the power of opposing the force of gravity, the power of clairvoyance, even the power of calling something out of nothing,‡ so to speak, and of evading even death. The acquisition of these powers is however not the aim. They are acquired only by the way, while striving through the last stage, *Samádhi*, to put the organism in the best advantageous position for development, and thus to free the *puruśa* from all sense of pain or evil This cursory and superficial glance at this philosophy will at once show that Patanjali extended the mechanical principle of Kapila to that department of knowledge which is regarded as occult, and in which all kinds of teleological theories play the most prominent part, and enthral the reason of man.

---

* Called *chakras* which are six or according to some seven, or nine, or thirty one.

† *Brahma (Puruśa)*.

‡ From the all-pervading *ákáśa* which, according to this system, *potentially holds everything—act, word, or thought—in it.*

The next *Darsana* to note is the *Mimansa* of Jaimini It is only because it has some connection with *Adwaitism* that we introduce this system of thought in this place for as it will just appear, it is otherwise of no use whatever in the general history of the development of scientific thought with which we are concerned It has no connection whatever with the *Darsanas* already examined for it devotes itself entirely to the *Veda*, and the various ceremonies enjoined by the ancient hymns and the *Brahmanas* *Mimansa* means inquiry, rational investigation and accordingly this system devotes itself entirely to *the inquiry* of *Dharma* religious merit which, according to the author arises from carrying out the injunctions of the *Veda* Nothing note worthy however is said about the *Veda* being the word of God though it is asserted to be eternal, to be the creation of no man to prove which all kinds of very subtle discussions are maintained The carrying out of *Vedic* injunctions leads to the acquisition of *Dharma* which leads to Heaven This dialectical philosophy is therefore called *Dharma-Mimansa* as opposed to *Adwaitism* the exposition whereof by Vyasa is called *Brahma Mimansa* As the one deals entirely with the *formalism* of the *Veda* so the other devotes itself entirely to the *rationalism* of the *Upanishads* with this difference, however that it never like its colleague severs itself from the other schools of thought headed by Kanada Kapila Patanjali nay even by Buddha and Jina As the *Mimansa* of *Brahma* the philosophy of the *Upanishads is the real religion which leads to salvation it is* called *Uttara* or Final *Mimansa* as well the other *Mimansa* being called *Purva* or Preliminary, for we have already shown that *Dharma* or formalism is recognised by *Adwaitism*, only as a preliminary preparation for *Dnana* or science—the ultimate way to *Moksha*

We have seen that the Vais'eshika and Sankhya explain the phenomena of the universe by the theory of *creation** and *evolutes*† respectively —the Supreme genus of the one being *Sattá*, of the other *Prakriti* The *Adwaita* philosophy questions the very nature of our perceptions of *prakriti* (matter) and establishes that we are never conscious of any thing *beyond our consciousness* of the phenomenon, objective or subjective *Thought* and *being* are in fact so inseparably united that the attempt to separate the one from the other will be like the attempt of one trying to mount upon ones own shoulders Thought can never transcend Thought, and all that we are cognisant of is Thought—the *is*, the *esse* of *all* The supreme genus, therefore, under which all things can be arranged is *Ens* (*Sat*) which is the same as *Thought* (*Chit*) The specific differences of phenomena are incapable of clear analysis, inasmuch as they are inseparable from the *thinking Ens* We are conscious of certain *forms* and *names* no doubt, but we are always far from knowing *what* they are the names of The *substratum* of these phenomena *per se* is incapable of definition, and the only explanation of this complex fact of consciousness is that the *names* and *forms whatever they be* are mere *assumptions*, not independent of our *Thought*, and therefore unspeakably *indescribable* (*anirvachaniya*) ‡ Though we own the existence of these *names* and *forms* it is denied to us to say what, besides

---

* *Árambhaváda.* † *Pariṇámaváda*

‡Compare the Jaina theory called *Syádváda* or *anekántaváda* which says that all phenomena are *real* and *unreal* (*sat* and *asat*)—real so far as the *substratum* (*dravya*) is concerned, and *unreal* so far as the name and form (*paryáya*) is concerned. Thus there is no genus independent of species, and *vice versa* Compare also the *Upanishads* often declaring the universe to be a compound of Truth and Untruth

our Thought, they are the *creations* from or *evolutes* of. To say that Thought *changes* itself into phenomena, will be to contradict our undeniable experience of every moment proving to us the invariable uniqueness of Thought in all states and under all conditions. Hence, abandoning both *creation* and *evolution*, *Advaitism* adopts the theory of *assumption* (*vivarta*)—the mere unaccountable *assumption* of *name* and *form*, in *Thought* Thought and Being being thus inseparable, the supreme genus is a componnd of both(*Brahma*).This is *Advaita—non-duality* This philosophy reduces all *knowledge* to this*Advaita—Brahma.* It examines the relation and sequence of the various *names* and *forms*, but it never *pretends to dive into the* ultimate nature of their substratum which is a grand *mystery*(*adnâna*). Thus this philosophy supersedes the theory of Genera and Species—for they never exist independent of each other; and of *puruṡa* and *prakṛti*—for all we are conscious of is Thought which is Being' and *prakṛti* as such is a mystery not capable of definition; by its compound of Thought-Being—Brahma—the Grand Unit. Let us try to put all this in an analytical form.

The *Advaita* begins with examining the divisions of *Prakṛti* and clearly demonstrates, perhaps for the first time in the field of ancient Indian Rationalism, the truth thatthe fiveelements—*A'kâśa, Vâyu, Tejas, Jala, Pṛthvi*—are but five *states* of *prakṛti* derivable from one another. From *A'kâśa*, whose specific mark is *Śabda* which, by the way, we render not by sound but *differentiation*, proceeds *Vâyu* (gaseous matter) with its specific mark *sparśa* (touch) superadded to the original *śabda*; *differentiation* in *Vâyu* leads to *Tejas* (heated matter) with its specific mark *rupa* (form, heat, light) superadded to *śabda* and *sparśa*; from *Tejas, Jala* (liquid matter) with *its specific* mark *rasa*, (taste), and from *Jala, Pṛthvi* with its specific mark

gandha (smell).* Thus the five *Tanmâtras* and the five *Bhutas* of the *Sânkhya* are reduced to *A'kâśa*, the all-pervading potential form (ether) of original matter (*Mula-prakṛti*). Now there remain the eleven *Indriyas*—organs of action and perception, together with *Ahankâra* and *Mahat*, which 13 also are shown to be no elements but mere evolutes, as will be seen further on. Thus all is reducible according to the *Advaita-Vâda* into one primordial substance which for the present we may contiuue to call *Prakṛti*. The next step, the most difficult one, is to assert that *prakṛti* and *puruśa* are one and the same thing—*dead matter* as such is nowhere to be found, nor is *mind* (*puruśa*) ever to be seen *without* it. In other words, mind without matter and matter without mind, (thought without Being and *vice versa*) is a logical as well as natural absurdity, and all *Dvaita* (duality) is an entire misconception. There is no *Dvaita*—duality. We are to mark the carefulness with which the expression is chosen. All is *A-Dvaita*, not all is *Eka* (one) *i. e. duality* is *denied*, but the convertibility of matter and mind, is *not asserted*.† Herein will appear a sharp line of distinction between *Monism* and *Advaitism*. But this distinction will appear, on careful consideration, to be more imaginary than real; for where *Advaitism* maintains the *inseparability* of mind and matter, *Monism* maintains the possibility of *deriving* the former from the potentialities of the latter. Either way, nothing more nor less is asserted, nor indeed, can be asserted, than the *inseparability of mind and matter*. This view of the *Advaita* naturally leads to the question: What is the

* *Taittiriyopaniśad*.

† See the *Brahma Sutras* Book II. ch II. where both are said to be *ananya* (inseparable,) but not *abhinna* (one) See also the *Bhâmati*.

nature of the two terms of this unity? The *Advaita-vâda* does not recognise the distinction of mind and matter to consist in the phenomena of *force* or *energy*, nor even in the manifestation of the "*mysterious vital force;*" for these it agrees with monism in regarding as sufficiently explicable from the potentiality of matter. To be brief, *force* or *vital force* is the *prâna* of *Advaitism*—a kind of *vâyu*. Sensation, volition, and reason, the functions of mind, are in a sense deducible from matter. But the very elementary notion which is the counterpart of matter, is *knowing—Dnâna*. It being so, we must finally dismiss the word mind which we have hitherto used for convenience and clearness, as it is incapable of conveying to us the idea of the antithesis of *knowing* and *not-knowing*, implied by the terms mind and matter in *Advaitism*. Mind, as understood by *Advaitism*, is not the *ultimate* and *simple* result of our analysis of nature; but it is an intermediate complex phenomenon of organic development. *Advaitism* defines the *ultimate* and *simple* factor of all our knowledge as *that which while cognising phenomena remains itself unaffected and unaltered**. The eye which does not change with the changing phenomena it perceives, may be the ultimate fact of our intellectual perceptions; but as its conditions—shortness, blindness, dimness &c.—are cognised by the mind which, for the time, remains unchanged, the mind may, in all probability, be this fact. But the mind i. e. volition, reason, feeling &c., is, cognised, in its turn, by a something which is not cognised by anything else, for it is unique and unchanging. This something, then, is the ultimate, unique, self-cognisant and constant fact of all our perceptions, the fact which under-

* *Drgdrśyaviveka* and illustrations and comm.

lies all nature, *in* and *through* which everything *is*. There is no ignoring it, for in the very act we admit it. It is the very *essence* (*esse* being) of Nature. It is unconditioned, and therefore indescribable; it is unique and constant, therefore eternal. In its uniqueness there is no diversity, and therefore no evil as such, it being the result of duality, the pure *esse* is all bliss, all love, the *unity* that knows no *limit* (*parichheda*) either *qualitative* or *quantitative*. It is *it*, niether *he* nor *she*. Of it is all Being (*sat*), all Thought (*chit*), and all Joy (*ánanda*). These three words, *sat, chit, ánanda,* are] an approximate *expression* of the Inexpressible Ineffable Reality—Thought-Being. Thus we see that we must not call it mind; nor even soul; for soul implies individuality—limit (*parichheda*) which the unlimited and unconditioned knows not. Let us then call it by its proper *Sanskrta* name, *chit*—Thought as contra-distinguished from matter, the *indescribable* Being. We shall shortly have to replace the word matter also, by an equally significant *Sanskrta* correlative of *chit*. What is matter? What is *prakrti?* The question is already answered when we say that it is never independent of *chit*. We can never conceive of matter but *in* and *through chit*, and can therefore never say *what it is*. *Ignoramus* is the only way out of the difficulty. And yet do we say that it *does not exist*? Again *Ignoramus*. Matter *exists*, but not as an ultimate and simple invariable fact of our perceptions like *chit*, for it takes on itself many changes of *name* and *form*. Though the limited character of our subjective nature denies to us real knowledge of matter *per se*, we cannot rid ourselves of all idea of its objectivity. It is neither *existent* nor *non-existent*, that is, it does not exist in the same sense as *chit*; it does not not exist in the same sense as the horns of a hare. It is neither *esse, nor n-esse; neither sat nor*

asat—it is Indescribable. We are only congnisant of the various *shapes* it passes through, but of its nature as matter we know absolutely nothing. We know that it is, we do not know that it is not, we *must* call it indescribable. And why is it so? It is, and it must be so from the very necessities of our nature—from *chit* being never apart from *matter*, and *matter* being never separate from *chit*. Thought and Being are always *inseparable*; *subject* and *object* are always one. All our knowledge, in fact consists of *chit* and *forms* of matter. The former *constant* and *eternal*, the latter *changing* and *non-eternal*; both always inseparable, whence the text "this universe is a compound of Truth and Untruth, Real and Unreal.*" We have in this short analysis tried to examine the nature of *chit* as well as *matter*, and have arrived at the following results. Of *chit* we have seen that it is unconditioned, unique, eternal and therefore free from evil. Of matter, which is a complex phenomenon, we have determined that:—

(I) It is a *thing* of which we know *nothing*;

(II) It is Indescribable;

(III) It passes into many *shapes* which alone are cognisable and form, besides *chit*, the circle of *the knowable*, which comprises all our sciences.

And lastly, as to the relation of *chit* and *matter* we have seen that *chit* and *matter* are not separable; Thought and Being are one, and the universe consists, therefore, of the real and the unreal mixed together.

In its three aspects *prakṛti* has three different names: (I) *Adnána*, (II) *Anir-vachaniya*, (III) *Máyá*. The first name, *A* (not) *dnána* (knowing), may naturally lead one to believe that it is the *negation* of *dnána*; i.e., mere blank,

* *Brhadárnyaka.*

ignorance; but as the foregoing explanation must have clearly shown, it is not the negation of anything, but a *positive entity* of which *we know nothing,* and it is therefore called *adnána,* for want of a better word. Though *Adnána* is opposed to *dnána* which is *chit*, it is not destructive of the latter; for it is not a negation, but a positive substance which exists *in* and *of chit.* The second name *Anirvachaniya* (indescribable), though plain enough, has also caused equal confusion. We have seen that *prakrti* is neither *existence (sat),* nor *non-existence (asat)*; and is therefore indescribable. This is twisted in a manner to *make this state appear as absurd as possible by saying that it is* equal to the assumption of a positive middle between *sat* and *asat,* which cannot logically follow. The third name *Máyá,* is like *Adnána* and *Anirvachaniya*, a bone of contention among the various scholastic philosophers of India, and has given rise to such a cob-web of impenetrable metaphysics that those who do not care to look deeper are easily led to regard the whole philosophy as mere nonsense. *Máyá* means illusion; *prakrti* is an illusion no doubt, but not an illusion in the sense of having no basis to stand upon. This basis cannot be *chit* which is never variable; but it is itself—the indescribable, as we shall just see. Inasmuch as it passes into *many shapes* without allowing us to penetrate the veil that covers it, it is nothing more nor less than an illusion; but that it must *exist* is a necessity of thought, and its existence in *some form* cannot be an illusion. The subtleties of scholastic metaphysics suggest *that it is an illusion* out and out, *chit* being sufficient to send forth these illusions from within itself. Nothing can, however, be further from the truth which this philosophy teaches. In the first place *chit* is formless, constant, unique. How in the world can this pass into any shapes? We may be, and are,

conscious of the illusion, in and through it of course; but the source of the illusion is not to be sought *out* of itself but *within* itself. Hence *Máyá* does not mean illusion out and out, but illusion so far as the many *names* and *forms* of *prakrti* are concerned.* But though *there is thus a substratum for this* illusion, *apart* from *chit*, it does not subvert the theory of the *Advaita*; for in the very beginning of our explanation we have shown that *Advaita* does not mean the existence of a *single substance*, nor even the *unity* of matter and mind, but their *inseparability*. *Advaita* means, *non-dvaita*, *non-duality*. Thought and Being are inseparable, not one. This idea is expressed by the word *Brahma* (something large enough, unlimited), a name common, as it must be, to *chit* as well as *prakṛti*, for both are inseparable. The universe is *Brahma*. So, then, *prakṛti is Adnána, Anir vachaniya, Máyá.*† As contra-distinguished from *chit* it is called *Jada* (dead matter), which name we shall, hereafter, adopt for matter. *Chit* and *Jada* are inseparable, and are, therefore, *Brahma*, the sole Ineffable Reality. *Brahma is called Bhumá, the* unconditioned, which requires no expalanation. It is called also *Atman*, which, being generally translated by the word *self*, for want of a better one, is likely to be misunderstood. Some argue that the sages of the *Upanisads* believed that every object has a *self*, and all the selfs, so to speak, being one are called *Atman*, by way of expressing the *reflexive* notion. This

---

* See especially a brief verse (20) in the *Drgdṛśya viveka of Bháratitirtha*, appended to my *Rájayoga*,

† The two aspects of *Prakrti—Adnána* and *Máyá* are sometimes called its two *Śaktis* (powers); viz, *A'varana*, that which *covers*, conceals its *real nature*; and *Vikṣepa* that which makes *it throw* out of itself many *forms*—the *covert* and *overt* actions of matter, as we shall call them.

language is ambiguous, if not wrong. Self implies individuality which is foreign to the nature of *Brahma*, but as all individuality is in and of *Brahma*—self, soul—individuality is said to be the same as, inseparable from, *Brahma*. It is in this double sense of *self* and *Brahma*, of the inseparability of the two, that the word *A'tman* is used. It is something like the Platonic *Demiurgos*, not this or that self, but the Supreme self, the unconditioned *Brahma*. So then, just as *Prakrti*, *Adnána Anirvachaniya*, and *Máyá**, are names of *Jada; Dnána* and *Sat* are names of *Chit*; and *Brahma*, *Bhumá*, *A'tman* †, are names of the inseparability of the two, the Universe as a whole, *Advaita*. We have thus seen what simple scientific meaning *Advaita* bears, notwithstanding the many metaphysical subtleties which uselessly mystify its import. This philosophy recognises no *duality*, and asserts no *unity*; but maintains *inseparability*, whence the name *A-dvaita*, *non-duality*;—in other words, not *A-bheda—unity*, but *Ananyatva—inseparability*. Real knowledge is the knowledge of the *Advaita*—the *dnána*; for *Brahma* is the only Reality, in all time and all places. Of its two factors, *chit* is the only *thing* constant and unique‡, and *perfectly knowable*; *Jada*, though inseparable from it, is not *knowable* in itself, but through the names and forms it

* There is one more name, *Avidyá*, which is only a minor technicality, and will be explained further on.

† These three are not always used strictly in this sense, for we sometimes find them used for mere *chit*, as opposed to *jada*.

‡ That *chit* is unique and constant is proved by an appeal to experience. If it were changing, all our knowledge of the past as connected with the present, in such forms as I who was a child am now a man, would be impossible Even the unity of our sleeping dreaming and waking experience will be broken Hence it is the Absolute even Relativity is knowable through it.—*Panchadasi*

assumes; and is, therefore, not constant, but illusory. All substances, whether inorganic or organic, are *known* to *exist* as subjects or objects of *joy*, only because they possess *chit*, *sat* and *ânanda*. These three which are *constant*, plus *name* and *form* (*Mâyâ*) which are *not constant*, constitute *Brahma*, the whole of the universe, the absolute Reality, the true *Advaita*.*

The nature and relation of *chit* and *jada*, though thus generally expressed as *Brahma*, have been variously viewed by numerous thinkers of this school. Each has his own theory according to which he explains the whole philosophy, *in its physical and metaphysical, including the ethical, aspects. Though we have tried, as far as possible, to put together simple scientific facts common to all of them, a few words devoted to those* most generally favoured will not be out of place. Before we notice the *Advaita* theories, let us understand those to which they are opposed. The first that is meant to be set aside, is the theory of Kaṇâda—the teleogical theory, called *ârambhavâda* or the theory of *creation*. The second is the theory of *pariṇâma, evolution*,† which is partly denied, and partly admitted. It is denied that *Puruśa* and *Prakṛti*, both inseparably united, are capable (as asserted by Kapila) of evolution. It is admitted that *prakṛti* or *jada* is capable of evolution. *The general theory by which the Advaitins explain their philosophy* is the *vivarta-vâda*. *Vivarta* means *assumption*, which is not the real nature of the substratum (of that assumption), as a rope, *assumed* to be a snake, a line of water, a garland etc, or, as *Brahma* assumed to be the names and forms, existing in and of it. As the snake and the garland etc, are mere names, the

---

* *Swârâjya-Siddhi* of *Sureśvar*.

† *Pariṇâmaśkâranâbhinnam kâryam* (the *evolute* not independent of the nature of its evolving cause).—*Siddhânta-leśa*.

rope being the real thing; so are *names* and *forms* mere illusion, the real thing being *Brahma*. As want of proper light etc, are the cause of the mistake in the one instance, so want of *right knowledge* is the cause of the mistake in the other. This false knowledge making *Brahma* the cause of *names and forms*, is called *Adhyâsa*. Right knowledge will show that *name* and *form* are but the endless *evolutes (pariṇâmas)* of *Mâyâ*, whereas *Brahma*, through which they are *known to exist*, is only falsely *assumed (vivarta)* to be their cause. The *Adhyâsa*, born of ignorance, is without beginning, but has an end in *right knowledge* of the *Advaita*. As to why or how we are led to take the rope for a snake, how we attribute reality to the *forms* of *being*, the *Advaita*, true to its hypothesis of the inseparability of *thought* and *being*, says that the process is indescribable, but the fact is there and cannot be ignored, nor comprehended in any other manner*. This is the *Vivarta-vâda*. It however does not satisfy subtle metaphysics which would not admit the logical necessity that there must exist some real snake, before we can *assume* it in the rope, for such an admission will subvert the theory of non-duality. The explanation (of the *Advaita*) is therefore sought in another

---

* It is not *Anyathâ khyâti* (as the *Naiyâyikas* maintain)—the confounding of a previously seen object with the one before us, for *jada per se* can never have been so observed; nor is it *Âtma khyâti* (as the *Bauddha* Idealists say)—the projection of the subjective idea into objective form; for then the form must have preceded the idea, nor *Akhyâti* (as some of the *Mîmânsakas* argue)—non perception of the thing for want of proper instruments; for in such a case knowledge in any *form ought to be im*possible, nor *Asat khyâti* (as the *Bauddha* Nihilists propound)—the perception of that which the thing is *not;* for this will simply be impossible —Vide beginning of *Śârira Bhâshya* and the *Ratnaprabhâ* and *Bhâmati*

manner. The whole of *Máyá* (name and form) is only a creation of the mind (*vṛtti*); it is not *out* of it but *within* it, just as in *Brahma* or *chit* is *jada*. *Jada* is so long as *chit* is, so *Máyá* is so long as mind is. To make the position clear, we must refer to the general theory of perception held by the *Advaita* philosophy. The power of the mind to perceive objects is called *vṛtti*. The *chit* in the *vṛtti* becomes one with the *chit* in the object, and perception follows.* The *vivartavádins* say that this *vṛtti* is led astray by eternal *adhyása*—the property of *jada*. If the *vṛtti* is led away by *adhyása* to a false notion, that false notion must have some definite objective existence. To grant this position will be to abandon the theory of *Advaita*; not to grant it will leave *adhyása* unexplained. So the other side maintains that the *vṛtti* has within itself from eternity several ideas which it only reflects, which it only continues to dream out. *It perceives itself*. The supression of these *vṛttis* is the highest end. We are not sure whether there is no objectivity of any kind. All is subjective illusion. This is called the *Dṛsti-sṛsti-váda*.† There is, however, in this theory also, nearly the same difficulty as that involved in the *vivarta-váda*; for, instead of the eternal objective *adhyása*, we have the eternal subjective *vṛttis*; though there is of course this advance that the external world is reduced to mere idea. To avoid this difficulty some say that all *forms* are created by *Iśvara* (a technical term—not meaning God, for the present), and they never interfere in any way with *Jiva*, the individual. The *Jiva* only *creates* a fresh world of its own, and contracts the idea of pleasure and pain. Hence several writers say that "duality creat-

---

* Vide *Vedántaparibháśá*.

† Vide *Yogaváśistha*.

ed by *Isvara* never interferes with the individual but its own creation does' This is the *Srsti drsti vâda* * Even here, seer and seen, *Isvara* and *Jiva*, a duality is implied In the theory of *vrttis* also the same duality is implied, though in another manner Hence there are others who try to explain the phenomena of duality by the *Avachheda* and the *Bimba-prati bimba vâdas* The former expounds that limits, falsely created by Maya in the unlimited give rise to *drsti* and *srsti* and every namable phenomenon of the Universe Real knowledge consists in freedom from *avachheda* which is of three kinds—limitation in oneself from objects of the same class, and from objects of a different class, as the tree distinguished as such from its leaves, branches etc, from other trees, and from stones men etc. *which are not trees These limits are only* a creation of the individual as individual, for in *Brahma* the unlimited there is no individualisation whatever To be free therefore from all sense of separateness is real knowledge and bliss.† The other theory not satisfied with the idea of *ava chheda* which is only a repetition of the theory of *adhyasa* under a new name argues that *Brahma (bimba)* is only reflected *(pratibimba)* in so many ways in nature and gives rise to phenomena ‡ Even this is equally misleading for there is no real substance independent of *Brahma* in which it can be reflected The last therefore, and the generally accepted theory is the *Ajâta vâda* or *praudha vada*, as it is frequently called It *lays down that separate existence in any and every form whether* as *vivarta drsti srsti avachheda* or *pratibimba* is false, nothing is capable of so existing all is as it is *(Ajata)* all is *Brahma* This is called the *praudha* (great real logical) *vada* as it is the

---

* *Panchadasi* and *Siddhantalesa*

† Vide *Panchadasi* as also *Madhusudana* on the *Bh Gita*. ‡ *Panchadasi*

only one consistent with the philosophy of the *Adwaita**. This is beautifully expressed by an incident between the great teacher Yâdnavalkya and one of his pupils who asks him to describe the *Adwaita*. The teacher holds his peace, though the question is thrice repeated, and says in the last resource that the *Adwaita* is best described by silence, for all *describing* means *dvaita*. The *Panchadaśikâra* also says :—"All arguments *pro* and *con* proceed in the language of duality, for in the language of the *Adwaita* there is no arguing and no speaking." Evidently *thought cannot transcend itself*. Thus *the most* logical theory an *Adwaiti* can adopt is the *Ajâta-vâda*—the inexpressible unity of Nature, a plain perfect denial of *creation* in any sense of the word, for the theory is pushed on even up to the denial of all causation†. These *vâdas*, very good in themselves as dialectical exercises, which may explain the nature of the *Adwaita*, end, not unoften, in refinements which always mis-lead. I have given them in their most general *and simple, perhaps for the very reason inaccurate,* form to help the reader in forming a clear idea of *Adwaitism* without *interrupting, at the same time, the character or connection* of our inquiry. Thus all is reduced to one grand Genus, all specific differences being *indescribable*.

IV. CREATION.

"*It is true that our human knowledge, in all things fragmentary, is* especially so in this case, on account of the extreme incompleteness and defectiveness of the records of creation."

Haeckel, Hist. of Creation, Vol. II. p. 37.

* Vide the *Kârikâs* of *Gaudapâda*, and the *Vârtika*.

† Vide *Gaudapâda* in his *Kârikâ* on the *Mândukya* ch. IV. verse 40.

We have tried to analyse the nature of the *Advaita*, and seen that it is the only reality through and of which the *knowable* and *unknowable exist.* This Reality is the same as our individual consciousness, having in it no *diversity,* always one, and impossible to ignore, even in the state of complete suspension of all knowledge—sleep—and therefore Eternal. The material part of it, which presents itself to us by its power of overt (*vikśepa*) and covert (*ávaraṇa*) action in many *forms*, and yet remains itself ever *unrevealed*, is, though an illusion (*Máyá*), the only thing to account for creation. Let the word creation not mislead us, for *Brahma* never *creates ; prakṛti* envolves itself, and creation, therefore, means this act of evolution and no more. The laws of the sequence and interaction of the *forms* of *prakṛti*, constitute the department of science, and we may try, in this place, to see how *Advaitism* explains the evolution of the universe. It is of course vain to expect anything like an examination and analysis of palæontological phenomena, or an investigation of the facts which constitute the group of biological sciences. We find traces of both the one and the other in the *Puráṇas* (later mythologies), and the *A'yurveda* (science of life, i. e. science of medicine) respectively; but *Advaitism* deals only with general conclusions, the steps whereof we are left to imagine and supply in the best manner we can. The only thing to help us are the various *vádas* just described ; and the plan which I intend therefore to adopt, is to take the most generally received *váda*—the *Bimbapratibimba-váda*, as my guide, and make free use of the *Puráṇas* also, in tracing the evolutions of *prakṛti* consistently with the philosophy of the *Advaita*. If the results, however dissimilar, should present some resemblance to the conclusions, or even

further divides itself into *suddha-sattvá* or part having perfect passiveness and *asuddha sattvá* or part having partial passiveness It will be seen as we proceed that of these three divisions of *prakrti*, the grossest developes most, the grosser only *passing* through the evolutions of the former and the least gross remaining undeveloped but active in its indirect action on the other two This is as it ought to be for the laws of differentiation, repulsion and attraction, act with greater force in gross combinations of matter than in finer ones The part with perfect passivity becomes, as it were, a centre of creation, and acts on the original gross part giving rise to the five elements *A'kása, Váyu, Tejas, Jala*, and *Prthvi* with their respective *gunas* enumerated in the preceding section, At this stage, primordial matter begins to pass through these five conditions and assumes forms varying from the ethereal to the solid These five elements, though produced from matter with the *tamas* predominent in them, possess some tint of the original *sattva* and *rajas* as well So, from each of the five with their peculiar *gunas* are produced the *sáttvic* and *rájas* sets of organs—the organs of perception*, and the organs of action†, respectively The second element of these five, *Váyu*, is capable of putting things in motion and thus giving rise to the phenomena of *force* called *prána* These *pránas* are generally regarded to be five or even ten, according to the functions they perform in the organism The five functions of this force in a sufficietly developed organism, are vitalizing, regulation of the fœces etc, digestion, speech, and energising the whole called respectively by five different names *Prána Apana, Samana, Udana, Vyána* Vitality

*Th senses of *sound, touch, form, taste*, and *smell*

†The organs of *speech, sound, action, motion, discharge*, and *generation*

or more properly *force* which is produced at the second step in the development of matter prepares, in combination with the group of the ten organs just described, the way for organic devolopment. As yet all exists in that potential condition wherein nothing save a mass of matter, in one condition or other, is discernible. The chemical conditions, so to speak, for the complete manifestation of organic life are there, but in the most elementery state.

The next step in development is the interaction of the five *sáttvic* organs of perception, which produces *Manas*—the mind, the apparatus which receives and retains impressions—and later on *Buddhi*—reason which determines, manifests the phenomena of volition. These are called the *Antahkaraṇa*—the internal organ (of perception). *Manas* is subdivided further into two parts. *Manas* only cognises generally; but the way in which it individualizes, limits, the cognised thing or phenomenon is called *Chitta*, and the way in which it assumes control over that *created individual* is called *Ahankára*, egoism. These four make up the *antahkaraṇa*.

We have seen that the five *práṇas* are already evolved from the vital force of the cosmos. This is called the *Práṇamayakośa*—the vital envelope—of the universe. When in the next stage, the *sáttavika* organs develope into the *antahkaraṇa*, two other envelopes are formed: the *Sentient* and the *Volitional*, the one governed by *manas*, the other by *buddhi*, and called the *Manomaya-* and *Vidnánamaya-kośas* respectively. These two envelopes constitute what is generally called the mind of nature; for matter has, at this stage, developed into a condition capable of receiving impressions, and manifesting some kind of mental action. Vitality, sensation, volition, being, as it were prepared, the next step is to find for these a ground to manifest

themselves upon, that is, some organism wherein these conditions can appear To this stage nature developes itself by joining the embryonic *rājas* organs of action with these three envelopes In fact the two developments cannnot proceed on independent lines, they go hand in hand, but we cannot but describe them as following each the other The three envelopes together with the five *rājas* organs, in all 17, constitute what is called the *sukma* or *linga deha* of the Cosmos The whole of nature at this stage is in a condition to manifest life, and developes henceforward into forms more and more complex which under suitable conditions manifest not only life, but sensation, thought, and volition, in a greater or less degree

We have, all through these stages left out of account that division of *prakrti* which we have called *Asuddhasattvā* It is called the *Kāranadeha* of the cosmos—the causal body the *cause* for which all other forms, as it were, exist, the original *monad*, so to speak It is that which finally developes, *through the three envelopes* we have described into individualised soul, and passes through various transmutations It being the first individualisation of *prakrti* and therefore nearest *Brahma* in its origin, is called the envelope of *sattva—ānanda gnosis joy* It is the cosmical envelope of bliss or no evil for in it originally there exists no misery, no evil, which it only *creates* by mixing with the three envelopes just described This part of *prakrti* is called *Kāranadeha* the causal body of the cosmos for it is as it were *for* this *monad* that the other part of *prakrti* passes into so *many developments, in other words, because* when the *tāmasa* part of *prakrti* developes itself into so many stages it remains as it is and continues its course through all the other evolutions This as we have observed at the beginning, is perfectly natural Gross matter must

evolve *ad infinitum*, whereas matter in a finer condition cannot so easily differentiate and develop itself into many forms. This *káraṇadeha* is free from evil, and is as such the body with the *A'nandamayakośa*—the envelope of no-evil, bliss; as the *linga-deha is the body with the three envelopes of práṇa, manas* and *buddhi*. The centre of force which is the *śuddhasattvá-prakṛti* acts on the *támasa*-part on the one hand, and *aśuddhasattva*-part on the other, producing the *lingadeha*, and investing the *káraṇadeha* with it. We shall have to return to this fact once more, so let us meanwhile proceed with the *four kośas* (envelopes) and the two *dehas* (bodies).

What are these envelopes and these bodies? We must bear in mind that subjective and objective devlopement must according to the theory of the *Advaita*, and all science as such, proceed on parallel lines, rather on the same line. The envelopes are, as it were, the *subjective* side of *prakṛti*, the bodies the *objective*. The first envelope is the envelope of no-evil, a blank, as it were; the second is the envelope of force, the third of sensation, and the fourth of volition. The corresponding bodies are the original monad (*káraṇadeha*) with its envelope of no-evil; and the miniature-body (*lingadeha*) with its envelopes of vitality, sensation, and volition. As the monad becomes energised from the centre of creation or force, it manifests sensation and volition by gradual developrment, and the corresponding objective development suitable to these stages takes place in the miniature-body. Thus we arrive at the Cosmic *lingadeha*, objective and subjective, with the *káraṇa-deha* underlying it. As yet, let me remind the reader, we are considering only the *káraṇa*- and *linga-dehas* of the cosmos, not of the individual. But this need not confound us. Individual development also,

proceeds on the same lines as cosmic developement, but individuals as *such appear only* in the third stage The third stage is explained to arise in the following manner Matter in its five primary states (*A'ká a &c*) continues differentiating under the action of the original centre of force It is interesting to note that this differentiation is never asserted to be by three or four or more divisions, but always by two and two— a scientific truth embodied in the theory of spontaneous generation Each of the five becomes two, and every half repeats the same process twice over that is becomes four Each element thus becomes divided into five parts The quarternary half of one unites with the single halves of each of the other four, thus producing 25 combinations in all This is called *Panchikarana* or the *multiplying by fives* This means that the primary forms of matter produce by interaction organic and inorganic bodies made up not of any one *form of matter*, but *of various forms* combined together This is called the *Sthuladeha* or gross body of the Cosmos Herein arise all kinds of beings minerals plants, animals, men, which put together constitute the Cosmic gross body It should be carefully noted that though we have described matter as passing through the five stages at the very beginning the gross, perfectly solid, state is reached only at this stage in developement The solid earth and the solid planets are all formed at this period, though existing already in the *form of Jatana* and *linga dehas* The *monad* developes objectively into the gross body and subjectively into what is called the *gross envelope of nourishment—Annamaya kosa*

Having arrived at the *Sthuladeha* of the cosmos (called *samashti*) which is nothing more than all the individuals (*vyashti*) in nature put together, it is easy to trace the *formation* of the

latter. The *great rule of Adwaitism is the unity of Pind*
(individual) and *Brahmánda** (the cosmos), and it plainly de
clares—as within, so without. Every individual is made up
therefore, of the three *dehas* with their respective *kośas*—the
one or the other being manifest or not according to the degree
of development. In man all the *dehas* with the *kośas* are fully
developed. The first is the *sthuladeha* sustained by nourishment and dependent on it, and is therefore called the *annamayakośa.* The second is the *lingdeha,* that fine material
condition in which vitality *(prána)*, perception *(manas)*, and
volition and knowledge *(buddhi)*, manifest themselves. *It is
from this deha that the sthuladeha derives its activity, for that*
is the plane of gross objective manifestation. The third *deha*
is the *káranadeha,* the causal body, the monad, the particular
individual in whose pure nature there exists no evil. As the
lingadeha has its *prana-mano*-and-*vidnána- maya-kośas*, so the
káranadeha has its *ánandamaya-kośa.* The *káranadeha* (monad)
in action with the *lingadeha,* as manifested on the plane of
the *sthula,* is called *Jiva*—the individual or *individualised
soul.* The *jiva* is pure bliss, *but it is made miserable*—it is
made to forget its *ánandamaya* nature—by this *individualising* of which, however, hereafter. Corresponding
to the three *dehas* are the three states of the human organism: waking, dreaming, and sleeping. The *sthuladeha* has
its full action in the first, the *lingadeha* being for the time
identified with it. In the second, the *sthula* is at rest, *but*
the *linga* is active. *The third is a suspension of all activity.*
Everything then merges into the *káranadeha* which is pure
bliss and *knowledge,* and as such, experiences for the
time its true nature—unity with *chit* or *Brahma,* the

* *Aitareyopanisad.*

great Unit It is by this *chit* that on waking we *remember* the pleasure of having slept sound If the *monad* were so far enlightened as not, even on waking to become identified with the other two *dehas*, it will be *mukta* (ever absolved) *Moksha* (absolution) is, in fact, as will be seen later on, a kind of constant *sleeping in waking* which condition is called the *turya* or the fourth Just as there are the three individual *dehas* corresponding to the three cosmic *dehas*, so there are three states of cosmic action, corresponding to the three states of the individual This will be taken up later on

I must here pause to make a few explanations It is said that *the development of prakriti proceeds by envelopes and bodies* and that the cosmos as well as the individual consist each of three bodies divided into five envelopes Now this statement is very likely to mislead and produce the impression that these envelopes and bodies are arranged one upon the other, like the layers of the earth, but nothing of the kind is meant They exist all mixed up together, as in the very nature of development they must be In the case of the cosmos, it is only meant to express the three stages of development, and in that of the individual the three sides of its nature inherited from them The distinction between organic and inorganic forms is only imaginary and all *beings* are developed from the same cosmic *dehas* and *kosas* the *karanadeha* being the point of existence the *lingadeha* the soul, and the *sthuladeha* the objective form Accordingly there is nothing without *jiva* or soul In the three cosmic bodies with the *five envelopes* man has only extended the application of that law of development which is being daily fulfilled within his own self—a way of reading nature not unwarranted by science which in a limited area traces the philogenitic develpoement of the tribe *from the ontoge-*

netic developement of the individual. But it may naturally be asked whether the ancients had any idea of the law of Descent, if they understood the principle, and applied it to nature? Comparetively it is a matter of very little moment how nature arrives at the stage of first organic or inorganic developement, for the most important point is the next stage—the developement of organisms from the primitive simple albuminoid to the complex organism of man. It is here that the greatest misunderstanding prevails, and if *Advaitism* has any explanation to give of these facts, its having understood the law of reading nature by the help of individual experience will be of some consequence. Before touching upon this subject let me finish the explanations with which we have started. The bodies and envelopes are, therefore, simple stages in the objective and subjective development of the cosmos and the individual, and need not in any way mislead us. It will, however, be asked, by the careful reader, on what ground we have called the envelopes the subjective side of *prakṛti*, for it is by our hypothesis only *dead* matter which as such can have no subjectivity. An answer to this question will finish the theory of evolution set forth by the *bimbapratibimbaváda* which we have adopted at the beginning.

The very hypothesis which assumes *prakṛti* to be dead matter, assumes also its inseperebility from something which deprives it of that character—viz. *chit.* The various developments of *prakṛti* are, as it were, so many mirrors of different powers of reflection, in which the *chit* (*bimba*) becomes *reflected* (*pratibimba*), and produces the subjective side. These *reflections* have their proper names in

each of these stages The reflection of *chit* in the *śuddhasattvapradhánâ prakrti* which is now called *mâyâ*, is styled *Isvara* (one that *directs*, governs, by its very powerful action the part called *tamahpradhânâ*) *Isvara* is called by yet another name just, as it were, to avoid its being confused with the general notion of God This *name is Antaryâmi, one that governs*, directs, from *within*. It is not the God the Creater, but it is only a centre of force or creation, as we have explained before It corresponds to the *Logos* of the Egyptian Mysteries and the Jewish Kabala, and the *Bahaman* of the Avestâ——it being the result, as it were, of *Vach* (the word), the first differentiation in *Brahma* which in that condition is called *sabdabrahama*—the cosmos in differentiation and about to create This technicology of the *Advaita* has led to all sorts of wild fancies about the Creater and his powers and works, in the latter *Purânas.* Through the action of *Îsvar* (i e *mâyâ*+*chit*), *tamahpradhânâ-prakrti* evolves into the *linga* and *sthula dehas*, as we have already seen. *Chit* i e *Brahma* is, through this *Isvara*, called the instrumental cause of the universe; and through the *tamahpradhânâ-prakrti* acted on by *Isvara*, it is called, also, the material cause of the universe But both the one and the other are mere *names*, for *chit* never acts, or is acted upon It is by an act of pure *spontaneous generation (vâch)* that the *prakrti*-side of *Brahma* evolves and becomes manifest through the *chit* side of the same Thus *Brahma* is the *one*, instrumental as well as material, *cause* of the universe * This is further illustrated by the spider and the web† he spins

* *Abhinnanimittopâdâna*

†*Mundakopanisad, I 7, also Śvetâśvatara 5 10 also Brhadâranyaka, 4 1*

from himself, a beautiful and convincing illustration of *spontaneous generation*, and a perfect denial of creation in any sense which the word *Íśvara* may lead us to suppose. Just as *chit* reflected in one part of *prakrti* is called *Íśvar*, so *chit* reflected in the other part—*aśuddhasattvapradháná*—is called *Prádna*. As the one part of *prakṛti* is called *máyá*, so this is called *avidyá* (non-*vidyá*, non-knowing, losing knowledge of itself—of the reflected *chit's* being identical with the original *chit*). The one part is lucid enough to admit of *chit* being reflected in all its power, but this the other is partly besmeared, and does not clearly reflect *chit* within itself. *Chit* in *máyá* is, therefore, *Íśvar*, the free governor; *chit* in *avidyá* is *Prádna*, the cogniser, the governed, the passer through the evolutions of the third—dark—side of *prakrti*. We have called this the *monad* much in the same sense as that given to it by Leibnitz, the inventor of the term. It is the *káraṇadeha*, *causal* body, for it is, as it were, for this *monad* (the *bhoktá*, sufferer, passer) that *Íśvara*, evolves, so to speak, the third side of *prakrti*. This is the first stage. In the second stage of developement—the *lingadeha*—the mainfestations or reflections of *chit*, the original *Íśvara* and *Prádna*, are respectively called *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Taijasa*: the one meaning *made of gold*, the other *made of tejas—light or heat*. It is implied that as gold or heat are sufficiently luminous, and discernable from the mass with which they may be surrounded, so the reflections of *chit*, at times manifest at times not manifest during their progress from the first to the second stage, become clearly visible in the form of cosmic and individual vitality as *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Taijasa* respectively, at this stage. *Hiraṇyagarbha* is called, also, by another name, corresponding to *Antaryámi*, viz. *Sutrátmá*—the thread

of vitality running through the *lingadeha* of nature the soul That which was only the invisible governor within is now the manifest thread discernible throughout This idea of *Hirnyagarbha* also has, like that of *Isvara*, led to the *golden egg of the Purânas*—it being the first creation of God Proceeding to the third stage produced by the action of *Isvara* on the five forms of matter, and called the *panchikrta* (five times five) or *gross*—*sthula*—state *Hirnyagarbha* or *Sutrâtma* is called *Vaisvânara* or *Virât*, and *Taijasa* is called *Jiva* The unmistakable *golden light* is now actual tangible light—*Vaisvânara* life The *thread* is *Virât* (the supreme magnified pervader), the *sum total* (*samasti*) of all *individualities* (*vyastis*) or *jivas* This idea of *Virât* becomes in the *Purânas* the actual personal form of God in which the universe is *seen* and Krs'na an incarnation of God, is made to show the whole universe in his mouth Thus we arrive at last to individual organisms which all put together is Nature or the Universe *Isvara Hirnyagarbha Vaisvânara*, or *Antaryami*, *Sutrâtmâ*, *Virât* and *Prâdna*, *Taijasa* and *Jivâ* are all *reflections* of *chit*, and as such, one with it It is the *adhyâsa*—*false assumption*—already explained to be without beginning, which makes the various *pratibimbas* to believe that they are apart *from chit*, and the *causes* possessors of the form of *prakrti* in which they are caught. The *names* and *forms* of *prakrti* give a false idea through *adhyâsa*—a function of the *antahkarana*—of pleasure and pain to the *monad*, and therefore, real knowledge (*dnâna*) of these reflections and *the forms of prakrti will break this adyâsa* and lead to *bliss* Thus is explained the subjective and objective development of the cosmos and the individual

The point thus explained by the theory of *bimba pratibimba* is rendered plainer in yet another manner by the theory of

Avachheda (limits). It says that the development of *prakṛti* causes, as it were, so many limitations in the one universal *Brahma—chit* and leads the *monad to believe them as* real. Limitation or distinction is of oneself from ones parts, from objects of the same class, and from objects of a different class. These three kinds of limit do not exist in *Brahma* which has *no parts, no like, and no unlike**. *This is verified* by an appeal to the state of sleep, as in the preceding theory, showing that therein, there is no sense of *avachheda,* and all is bliss. This bliss, however, is not final or real, for there is the monad with its *sanskâras—impressions* which, on waking, it will again call to life, and be involved in *limitations.* Hence the necessity of knowledge (*dnâna*). The *avachhedas* in *chit* are explained by a very apt illustration often used and argued upon by *Advaitins.* They appeal for an illustration to *A'kâśa* which is all-pervading, and therefore called *mahâkâśa.* The same enclosed in the cloud which sends *down rain is abhrâkâśa, and in the jar of clay which receives* the rain, *ghatâkâśa.* Lastly the *Akâśa* in the water contained in the jar is *jalâkâśa.* Just as one and the same *A'kâśa* is *limited* into four, so one and the same *Chit* is *limited* into four, or any number. *Mahâkâśa* is *chit, abhrâkâśa* is *iśvara,* and *ghatâkâśa* and *jalâkâśa* are *kutastha* and *jiva* respectively. *Kutastha* means that which stands like a *kuta,* the anvil of the smith, on which many *forms* are made *without its being ever* changed. In this theory the field of *kutastha* and *jiva* is the same, like that of *ghatâkâśa* and *jalâkâśa,* the one entirely covering, and *therefore not recognising, the other, though really* identical with it. *Jiva,* though the same as *kutastha—the Prâdna* of the previous theory—, is not allowed *knowledge* of the

* *Ekam Eva Advitiyam.* Chhând, up.

fact, by the *ávarna* and *vikshepa* powers of *avidyá*. This theory leaves out of consideration the *sutrátmá* of the previous theory, and passes direct from *Isvara* to *Jiva*. It brings forth yet another illustration in which all four are recognised, leaving out *kutastha*. The pure white canvass is *chit*; the same dipped in some preparation for securing proper texture is *antaryámi*, its being prepared by some colouring prior to its being painted upon is *sutrátmá* and its last form consisting of many pictures is *virát*.

Now we come to the concluding part of this section. The phenomena of sleep dream and waking are in their subjective and objective aspects appealed to in both the preceding theories for a proper reading of Nature. As within so without says the *Advaitin*, the *pinda* (body) is *brahmanda* (cosmos)—the *microcosm is a picture of the macrocosm*. The unity of Nature and man is the grand aim of Philosophy and if it reads either by the light of proper experience it does not depart from that well known law of Science which has achieved such grand results in the last twenty years. When the *Advaita* philosophy applies this law to the whole of the universe, and sees the three bodies and five envelopes in different degrees of development in *all* organisms rather *beings* it has in my opinion, achievid that which modern science is aiming at by its grand theory of Descent or Filiation. But it will be asked whether the same law is clearly applied to the Descent of man from the lower species? I would say yes for it appears it was understood in its application not only in the progressive but the retrogressive, direction also, as amply borne out by the much derided theory of transmigration. This however, is a subject belonging to the details of the laws of Descent, —the laws of Inheritance and Adaptation—and its consideration may therefore be postponed to the next section.

The development of *prakrti* proceeds through certain laws inherent in itself, but these are not the subject of consideration here. The law of *karma* is the law applied practically to the development of organisms, and may be extended, in its general character, to the whole of the universe; but this at least is the limited sense in which it is generally understood, and in which it is important for us to examine it.

Karma, or causes which govern the development of organisms, and account for the fact of their being what and where they are, is of three kinds: *Sanchita*, *Prârabdha* and *Kriyamâna*. The first includes those causes which begin in no beginning and give rise to others which act on the immediate development of being. These derived causes are called *prârabdha*—operating *before* the existence of any particular being, and immediately contributing to the existence of that being. The third class includes those circumstances which the being under the control of *prârabdha* produces, and which are as it were added to the primary *sanchita* to develope some day, into *prârabdha*. This chain of causes governing the past, present, and future of all beings would naturally suggest that there is no freedom of the will in the true sense of the word, and that human action is always *necessitated*. We say, yes, it is so, but there are various distinctions to be made in understanding the word necessity as used by the *Adwaita* philosophy which let me add is perhaps the only school of Indian thought, regarding development as really within the power of the individual* notwithstanding the said necessity. How could this be?

---

* Sankara in his *Aparokshan bhuti*. It is for the ignorant the *Vedas* bring in *prârabdha*.

Necessity, in the first place, is to be distinguished from the two kinds of necessity which are, as it were, external to man. The first is Mohomedan Fatalism *which regards everything* as pre-arranged by a designing Creator, and human will necessitated by this pre-arragement. The second is Christian Predestination or the doctrine of Grace (*freely used also by* the later Indian *Advaitins* of the 12th and 16th century)* which makes the good or bad actions of the human will dependent on the pre-ordained *election* of God. Both these are theories of final causes, and as such, can find no favour with *Advaitism*. *Karma* is a theory of mechanical or efficient causes, and the necessity it implies is a necssity explicable by the inherited capabilities of the organism itself, and not by any thing extraneous to it. The question still remains, how development can still be said to *depend*, in any sense, on the action of the individual; for it will, on the above showing, proceed on its own account from the action of inherited capabilities. Here again, the mistake arises only from confounding the word necessity with the two kinds of pre-arranged necessity just alluded to. This necessity carries with it no idea of pre-arraged sequences. It endows the organism with certain capabilities which must needs develop in a particular line, but it holds them capable of being modified in the struggle for life, by the laws of natural selection and adaptation. The individual inherits certain tendencies, but the adaptation is, partly at least, its own bussiness. The being adapted to certain circumstances, which also may have their own inheritance, may be argued to be a result of the original inherited necessity, leaving no room for individual action. This chain of reasoning would only lodge us in an *argumentaum ad-infinitum*, leading ultimately to the theory of Fatalism or Election. It is here that *Advaitism*, therefore, splits up *karma* in-

* See note at the end.

to three kinds. The inherited capabilities are the *prárabddha* —the infinite potetial *sanchita* of the individual in its kinnetic form—and the working out of these capabilities under proper circumstances by Adaptation is *kriyamáṇa—that which is being done* by the individual for its own progress. The individual, therefore, always engages itself in the struggle for existence, and seeks the position most advantageous to its development; but wherever it fails, it refers the failure to *prárabdha*, to the *past* which has overpowered the *present*. It is the working out of the inherited capabilities that is called *kriyamáṇa*, but its success or otherwise in reference to development, *is no more pre-ordained* than the final adaptation of the organism to any set of uncontrollable circumstances. *Prárabdha* and *kriyamána* are, in fact, the two mechanical forces whose resultant is the position of the individual at any given moment. Not to grant this is to accept the illogical theory of final causes—Fatalism or Election, both leading to infinite absurdities. Every organism tends towards development, towards that which it believes to be its happiness, and yet at times fails in the attempt—a circumstance independent of its volition, and therefore extraneous to it, extraneous not in the sense of being prearranged, but in the sense of necessitated by the tendency of inherited capabilities—*prárabdha*—which, in the particular case, have been over-powering. Not to add to the intricacies of the problem, it may, in brief, be said that adaptation is the very tendency of organisms to seek that equilibrium, that place in nature, peculiar to each, wherein there would be no disturbance. The struggle for existence is the struggle of numerous *prárabdhas* through the several individuals engaged in it. This is *kriyamáṇa* which leads the individual to its

proper place, and endows it with fresh capabilities for future development. That the individual has in this manner some share in moulding its course is a fact which cannot be denied, notwithstanding the strict necessity which always prevails. We shall try to see what is the *nature of the share* which falls to the *independent lot, so to speak, of the individual.*

The part the individual plays in the necessitated order of nature, consists in its *attributing* the action of necessitated circumstances to itself, consists, technically speaking, in *ahankâra*,—a false notion, *adhyâsa* again. This will lead to a side-issue as to the nature of happiness, and the origin of evil. It is here that *Advaitism* which, being free to adopt any theory of creation, is also free to accept any explanation of the laws of development, leaves the law of Adaptation whose action is admitted to be most mysterious even by its best advocates, to itself. It, however, says that evil as such does not exist in the true nature of things—which is, as will be remembered, *Brahma* (*chit*)—but only in the *adhyâsa*, the false knowledge, ignorance, which confounds *chit* and *prakṛti* together. The law of *karma* is all for *prakṛti*, and not for *chit* which being one, unique, and eternal, and therefore, the law of all laws, can have no law for itself beyond itself. The true nature of every individual (*jiva*) is to free itself from this *adhyâsa* which produces *ahankâra*, egoism, the attributing of the acts of *praktri* to the *ego*—the monad (*prâdna*) which, being really one with *chit*, never *does* anything. Evil arises only from *adhyâsa*. The true nature of *being* is *chit* which is no-evil, no-dealty, no-ignorance, no-*prakṛti*, not-this, not-that.* Thus, man must leave *prakṛti*

* This is the way in which the *Upanisads* logically describe *Chit*:—*Neti, neti*, not this, not that &c.

to work its own way through him, to its proper place in nature, but he must free himself from all idea of misery *which is no* part of *chit*, there being in it no variety and no misery as such He must acquire that true knowledge (*dnána*) which will prove to him his own unity with universal *chit*, and free him from the *adhyása* arising from limitation from his considering himself an individual, by falsely identifying his *self (chit)* with the different forms of *prakrti* All that can be proved to be unreal by *dnána* is necessarily false The order of nature—*Brahma*—is a fact which *dnána* has nothing to do with, but it is ignorance which prevents the true recognition of this blissful unity and creates evil that *dnana* can and has to demolish. *This dnána* being *acquired the individual has done* its work This will be more clear in the next section, but this position taken up by the *Advaita* philosophy shows what room it allows to the free action of the human will, under the strict necessity through which it works Willing, believing are all functions not of the individual but of *prakrti** which, makes the individual an individual falsely (by *adhyása*) of course The true nature *of the individual is pure gnosis* (universal *chit*) as amply borne out by the experience of deep sleep where no evil for the time exits To eradicate the sense of separateness (*avachheda*) is to be free from *karma* which will naturally work out its way to the proper place of the individual in the economy of Nature This is explained in yet another way by saying that the law of *karma* operates with strict necessity *on the material plane* (*which does not concern* the true self at all), but it has no power over the spiritual plane (which is the true self—*chit*) Thus there is freedom under necessity—a paradox easily explicable on the above show-

* *Ahankara* properly speaking

ing. Man *is* free by his very nature so far as his *chit* is concerned, he is under strict necessity so far as his *prakrti* is concerned—a result of the original *vivartaváda*, explaining evolution by the *parinámas* of *prakrti*, and the *vivartas* of *chit*. The difference is only in the *realisation* of the fact that the *jiva* is really free to acquire true knowledge—*dnána*—the "fire of which consumes all *karma* to ashes."* *This knowledge* is none other than the *jiva* destroying itself, becoming free from all limits, ceasing to stand in the way of Nature by *knowing* Nature.

So then, let us once more turn to the meaning of the three kinds of *karma*, and make our position clear by examining the results to which it must necessarily lead. *Every being (jiva) has its karma. We know that all the capabilities* inherited by a being are not developed all at once. They vary in their active manifestation from a few hours to periods covering considerable number of years. Hence, naturally enough, *karma* should be of two kinds in the first instance—those *karmas* which are only potential, and those which *have passed from the potential into the kinnetic condition*. The one is *Sanchita* the other *Prárabdha*. *Prárabdha* governs the development of the individual for what we call one life, one *stage* in its progress. When that stage is reached the *prárabdha* of the individual is exhausted, but it has its *sanchita* to draw upon. *To this sanchita* also have been added the *new* capabilities the individual has acquired during its life, during its development under *prárabdha*. This new acquisition is from *kriyamána*. Thus within the inconceivable infinity of *sanchita*, is the circle of *prárabdha*, and co-extensive with it, under its *influence*, *but on a different*

* The *Bhagvad Gita*

plane, is the circle of *kriyamāṇa*. The circle of *kriyamāṇa* is the circle within which the *jiva* has its individual responsible action, in whatever sense, we take the expression: for, referring to happiness as the ultimate motive under which the will acts, its freedom or necessity, depends on the meaning assigned to that word. We have seen that *Adwaitism* identifies happiness with *knowledge*—that knowledge which destroys the sense of separateness (*avachheda*), or the false notion (*adhyása*) arising from attributing the necessitated action of *prakṛti* to *chit* (the monad itself in its real nature). All evil arises from *avachheda* or *adhyása*, for in the nature of things, evil (*avachheda*) as such does not exist. The laws of *prárabdha* and *kriyamāṇa* will work out themselves. all the same, but want of true discrimination (*dnána*) will only continue to make their subject—the individual—miserable, by not allowing it an insight into its true nature where no misery exists. Thus, though man cannot control the material side of development, the spiritual side, so to speak, is quite within his power—there being nothing of development or non-development, but mere *recognition* or *dnána*. Though the laws of heredity and adaptation i. e. *prárabdha* and *kriyamāṇa*, of necessity, carry the being to its proper place in nature, the idea of unfulfilled desire—evil—is something for which the being itself, rather its way of looking at things, is to blame. Thus, *Adwaitism*, in limiting the action of *prárabdha* by *kriyamāṇa*, makes room for the future development of the being, and points out at the same time the way to be free from the action of *karma* i.e from the notion of evil, by independent *dnána*. This point may be carefully noted, for, the next section will be but a continuation of the argument which, for the present, we must leave.

It will be seen that the religions which make no room for *kriyamâṇa*, are exactly those most likely to fall into the error of Fatalism or Election, by precluding all chance of independent development to the *jiva* which, only after *one momentary* feat of its pre-arranged (not to say necessitated) *prârabdha*, leaps into the *eternity* of Heaven or Hell. This consideration leads to a question on which the greatest difference of opinion prevails. Is it possible, then, that the being passes through a series of births and rebirths? The very facts of the law of inheritence and adaptation, *prârabdha* and *kriyamâṇa*, must, if logically carried out, say yes. The original monad has to develop till it reaches that state of equilibrium in which it ceases to exist as a monad—the state of Natural Perfection (*mokśa*). Its true logical Purgatory is nature, this world, pre-eminently called the *karmaloka*—the plane of *karma*, whereon it finds opportunities, and acquires fresh capabilities, for development. Death and birth are but other names for the stages of this development, and all logic, call it Divine justice or what you will, requires that it should be so—the *being* must have its *periods* of trialand improvement. The question, however, remains, whether these births of the being are only in a progressive line or a retrogressive one also? Progression and retrogression are but relative terms, in the eye of Nature there is nothing like retrogression; *for, what we regard as such is progression—the progression proper to the condition of the monad.* In the struggle for life some *jivas* actually die out, and are left behind others which go on in the race of development. The one set has retrogressed, the other has progressed; but each has only sought its own place in nature for further development. Thus there is transmigration in the truest sense of the word: I do not see, how in fact, an *Advaitin*, an advo-

cate of the Unity of nature, can escape from the conclusion Krsna plainly says to Arjuna, that the *jiva* carried away by death at any stage of its developement, is but reborn in circumstances suitable to its nature to resume the thread of its developement, from the point where it left* This may all be true it will again be contended but what ground is there to say that there is a *jiva* a something which passes from one stage to another? This doubt is based only on a mis understanding of the words *jiva* (*being*) and monad Let us re fresh our memory by a reference to the previous section *Chit* reflected in *asuddhasattvâ prakrti* is *pradna* the *kârana deha*—monad The monad in the *linga deha* is *taijasa*, which again in the *sthula deha* is *jiva* So the *jiva* or *being* is the *original* monad—manifestation of universal *chit* in any aggregation of *prakrti* at a given point of its development Birth and death are all to *prakrti* and not to *chit* eternal *adhyasa* or *avachheda* being the cause of attributing the fun ctions of the one to the other So long as the *jiva* is *jiva* there is no *moksa* The *linga* with the *kârana* is *jiva*, and till real knowledge has dispelled the *adhyasa* and melted the *jiva* into *Brahma* it must survive the dissolution of the *sthula*—death—and continue to develop by gradual stages—births, transmi grations True *moksa* is the dissolution of both the *monad* and the *being*, but in the series of births the *monad*—*kutastha*—remains the same, the *being* alone changes The monad is as it were the potential reservoir of all acquired capabilities(*vasanas*) the being its kinnetic manifestation It is the *monad* that passes through various *beings*—births The question then is whether the law of Inheritance modified by the law of Adaptation con

---

* *Bhagvad Gitâ* ch VI

sisting of nutrition etc., as acting on any one organism, is sufficient to account for the reproduction from it, of another organism; or whether there are any other circumstances peculiar to this other organism itself? Are *all* the facts of any individual life accountable by Heridity and Adaptation? *Advaitism* has, as we have already seen, no other laws than these two, to explain the phenomena and facts of existence. It says, that oneself is only repeated in the child. But the modification of the law of heredity by adaptation, through nutrition etc, it has its own way of explaining. Death is but a prolonged sleep, and, as in the one so in the other, it is only the *sthula-deha* that is absent, that is dissolved The *linga-deha* survives, continues to develop, in that fine invisible state in which it has been explained to exist. This, under the law of repulsion and attraction, seeks its own like, and becoming a factor in the elements of adaptation, passes through heredity into its proper place, in a suitable *sthula-deha* again. Growth is the quality of the *sthula*; vitality, sensation and thought, are the qualities of the *linga*; the retention of the acquired potentiality of many stages of development (births) being the quality of the *kárana*. Heredity contributes to the *sthula*, but the *linga* cannot be the mere result of heredity; for all the psychological divergencies of organisms produced from, and under, the same circumstances are not explicable solely by it.

If we leave out of consideration the *transmigration* of the *linga-* and *kárana-dehas*, heredity alone will not be sufficient to explain all the physical and mental facts of every individual being. Children born under the same circumstances display, from the beginning, very marked psychological differences, not explicable by simple heredity. On the theory of transmigration all is as plain as anything. This,

however, will be regarded as a superfluous refinement in face of the absence of all remembrance of previous existence Apart from the great advantage which the individual derives in its free action from this loss of memory, we must bear in mind that it may, for aught we know, be only a partial suspension, and that it may at some stage of development, become nil As man has several faculties in addition to his progenitor the animal, so some future progeny of his may reveal yet another development in which even loss of memory may be suspended. Nor is this merely imaginary, for as the abnormal development of certain organs in man and animals shows to us the awakening of this remembrance also may be possible under some to us abnormal conditions The practitioners of *Yoga* lay claim to such powers, and I believe a study of their science, as also of the much complicated phenomena of dream, sleep walking, clairvoyance etc, may lead us to some possible way out of the difficulty Loss of memory is, however, a fact of nature, and cannot like all other facts of nature be questioned at all as to its why and wherefore It *is* so, and it is sufficient if if we can at once see that it *ought* to be so in favour of the independant action of the individual towards its own development

So then, as a suitable *sthula* the result of material development, is formed its suitable *linga* the result of the corresponding subjective development manifests itself in it, both, of course passing through the same channel but coming from different sources, as will be seen in the next section Practically the law is the same all organisms are produced from preceding organisms, both subjectively and objectively, but *Advaitism* adds this explanation of the development and manifestation

of each of its two sides, to carry out its own theory of *kriyamâṇa* and *prârabdha* to its logical issue. The *sthula* is entirely subject to heredity, and though the *linga* too is subject to the same, it survives death, and becomes joined, in its next stage of development, to its proper *sthula*, by way of what is called *transmigration*. Thus man becomes responsible not only for the physical and mental health of his progeny in particular, and his race in general, but also for *his own individual self* which he is bound to free from *adhyâsa* which leads to the preservation, and therefore, propagation, of his *linga*- and *kâraṇa-dehas*, his subjectivity.

Thus *Advaitism*, by its law of *karma*, explains the phenomena of development. Though it recognises no other laws than those of Heredity and Adaptation for the evolution of being, it carries the laws to their logical issue in its theory of the transmigration of the *linga-deha*, thus connecting all nature in one endless chain of evolution. Evolution logically carried out cannot, I believe, avoid this conclusion of the *Advaita*, and ought to feel no repugnance in accepting the possibility of our developing, on the one hand, into types more perfect than these hybrid bodies of ours, as also of being thrown back, on the other, into forms inferior to ours for the rectification of tendencies which may be impediments to further progress. We shall try to make the position of the *Advaita* yet more clear in the next section. We have here seen what laws of evolution the *Advaita* adopts, and what responsible share it allows to the individual in their working. Action, work, is the very law of *being*—even of the One Being—and no *prârabdha* can free any being from *kriyamâṇa*. The *being* can, and must, cease to *be*.

VI. MOKS'A.

"Groping in the darkness of *avidyâ*, and looking upon themselves as intelligent masters of wisdom fools, ever suffering ever murmuring, follow one another like the blind led by the blind"—*Mundakopanisad*

"As within so without, as without so within, who perceives anything like limitation, passes from death to death"—*Kathopanis'ad*

"When, to the enlightened, all is self, where could then be any delusion or misery in the Unity?"—*Is'opanisad*

When S'vetaketu, after a long residence with his preceptor returned to his father, boasting of his learning and acquirements, the latter gently asked him if he had any idea of that One thing by knowing which the unknown becomes known, the unheard of heard, and the unseen seen S'vetaketu was taken aback, and humbly requested Uddalaka to impart to him that knowledge which his *guru* had not imparted to him Uddâlaka declares that 'As by knowing one lump of clay we know all that is made of it it being mere play of words—name and form—so by knowing the One *Sat* (the Ens)—the substratum and beginning of all we know everything *This*, oh S'vetaketu ! is none other than *thy self** " Know All from One There is variety in Unity which alone is real Bliss

---

* *Chhandogyopanis'ad*, also *Brhadaranyakopanis'ad* The *Mahavakya* great word, the word of Truth *Tat tvam asi=Thou art It* *It* means the supreme *sat*, *Brahma* and *thou*, the *jiva* both are asserted to be one. *Jiva* has sense of variety and is therefore miserable, *sat* has no variety in it and is therefore all bliss, how could these be one? By the *bhagatyoga laks'ana*, the figure of speech which identifies the predicate and the subject, by leaving out the inconsistent factor of each. These *Mahavakyas* are four in number and a clear understanding of their import is the way to *Moksa* I have indicated the general way in which these are interpreted,

Where is then the *bandha*, the bond, from which we seek *mokśa*, release. *Mokśa*, properly speaking, is not to be understood as bliss, but only as release from some bond. Inasmuch as this bond exists in the form of evil, we often render the word *mokśa* by bliss. Whence does evil arise? Where is the bond? We have already seen that in the nature of things there is no evil as such, it is only in the *adhyása*, false knowledge, or *avachheda*, limitation. Both the one and the other are destructible by proper knowledge. The objective evolution of the monad will proceed *all the same*, *but its subjective* side will receive that light, that unification, which will show it its real place in nature; and free it from the sense of separateness which is evil. Hence S'ankara well argues in the introduction to his *Śárira-bhâsya* that *mokśa* is not a thing to be obtained, nor a condition to be produced, it is the very *nature of things* which ignorance *prevents us from cognising*. The destruction of this ignorance is what all teaching, *all science*, and all action, has to accomplish. The same thing is expressed by later dialecticians in another way by what is called the Kanthamaṇi-nyâya—the argument of the neck-jewel. Just as one having a jewel round his neck forgets it, and looks for it here and there; but rests in peace on being awakened to the fact of its never being lost, so the *jiva already in possession* of the jewel of bliss, looks for it out of itself, and feels miserable but being enlightened by true knowledge (*dnána*), realises that

---

though very interesting treatises, extending over thousands of pages, discuss and determine the Truth conveyed by them in a variety of ways. The *Mahávákya* here given is from the *Sámaveda*; there are three others of the same import from each of the other three *Vedas*: *Ayamátmá Brahma* (this *átman* is *Brahma*); *Aham Brahmásmi* (*I am Brahma*), *Pradnánam Brahma* (*knowledge* is *Brahma*).

unity in which there is no diversity (evil). All ordinary knowledge is of no use, real *dnâna* which leads to *mokśa* is that knowledge which is called *para*, the highest, the only one capable of destroying the sense of separateness*. This knowledge, besides, must not be merely theoretical, as then it does not at all conduce to the end—destruction of the sense of separateness; but it should be purely practical, it should, in fact, be one in which knowing, and believing, as also acting, are all combined. The nature of real *aparokśa* which is *mokśa*, is explained by a very apt illustration. As the worm being wrapt, as it were, in the thought of the bee that lays hold of it and carries it to its cell, finally turns into a veritable bee, so should one inspired with the *knowledge* of the *Advaita* (unity of Nature) *become Advaita* † Then only is real *mokśa* accomplished. This is real *aparokśa-dnâna* which *is mokśa*. Hence the *Advaitin* always regards *mokśa*, not as a thing, or even condition; he calls it simple *Dnâna*. *Mokśa*, in fact, is that return to nature, that recognition of one's *true* place in nature, wherein there is no evil; for, the *ajâtavâda*, explained in section III, declares "There is no limitation, no creation, no bond; nor even the worker, the aspirant, or the released—this is proper *dnâna*‡."

Evil arises only from mental creation, a function of *jiva*, and not of Nature. The creation of nature never interferes with the happiness or otherwise of any being, it is all harmony, peace, and progress; the creation of *jiva* is evanescent, illusory, and capable, therefore, of producing pleasure and pain to itself. If it were in the nature of things to produce pleasure or pain, the same object will not be the cause of pleasure to one, of pain

* *Mundakopanisad.*
† *Brhadâranyaka*
‡ *Gaudapâda* on the *Mândukya.*

and wills one way or other* *Manas*—mind, *Chitta*—individualizing, *Ahankára*—egoing, so to speak, and *Buddhi*—determining, are the four parts of the subjective side of man, and right knowledge begins in *buddhi* which must ever try to control the other three It is nearer *chit* in its nature, for, though, in deep sleep, all the other three are absent rather silent, *buddhi* in the form of *chit*—knowing—is not quite overpowered Sleep is, indeed a condition in which man is quite free at least for the time, from all mental creations i e evil and is most near the real nature of man, save and except in his yet being in possession, potentially, of infinite impressions (*sanskáras*) which, on waking, produce *chitta* and *ahankara* leading to the panoramic play of *avidyá* multipling the sense of evil (*avachheda*) *ad infinitum* That state of pure *gnosis* which is most like sleep is called *Turyá*—the fourth, meaning fourth in the order of waking dreaming and sleeping—*a continual sleeping in waking* 'The enlightened ever sleeps where the ignorant are awake, and he is awake where the ignorant are asleep' † Real *dnána*, the eternal *moksa* is in the annihilation of this *antah karana* this subjective side of the *lingadeha* which creates the sense of separateness by *individualizing* (*chitta*), and *egoing* (*ahankara*) objects and phenomena This can be accomplished only by proper *dnana* of *Brahma*, the Great Law, Nature He who is free from *chitta* and *ahankára* is not responsible even if he were to destroy the three worlds '‡ This is called *jivan mukti* the state of absolution prior to *dissolution* death,—a fact easily *realizable* after what explanation we have given, but not clearly admitted as possible in any other system of

---

* *Buddhi* *Pt budh*—to know that which *knows*

† The *Bhagvad Gita*

‡ *Bhagvad Gita*

Indian philosophy. The *destruction*, or rather proper analysis, of the *antahkarana*, and the acquisition of the *turyá*, the *fourth* state, continual waking, translated in the language of science, would only mean, the development of the monad, both subjective and objective, to that condition in which it knows and finds its proper place in nature, that place where there is perfect equilibrium, and where the law of adaptation is no longer at work. The suspension of the law of adaptation puts us in mind of the *kriyamána* of the *Advaitaváda*. *Kriyamána* no longer affects one who is enlightened. For, though his *prárabdha*, heredity, will keep him on till it is all spent, his *kriyamána* will not accumulate any fresh potentialities to be added to the source (*sanchita*) whence *prárabdha* rises. He works and acts all the same, but "*As so many rivers flow into* the ocean and keep the waters still within their bound, so even do all acts pass into the enlightened"*. The *antahakarana* " stands only like the jet of a lamp in a place protected from the smallest breeze"†; and *kriyamána* having no effect, *prárabdha* only works itself out, without affecting the monad in any way. It has found its equilibrium in nature, has ceased to exist as an individual,—" *the karmas being reduced to* ashes, by the fire of *dnána*"‡.

As the Individual seeks its own subjective as well as objective equilibrium, by identifying itself with, or knowing, *Brahma* (Nature); so does Nature as a whole, seek its own equilibrium in unfathomable Eternity. Let us again return to the theory of *Yugas* and *Kalpas*. We have seen that there are two kinds of cosmic suspensions or destructions, called *pra-*

* *Prašnopanišad*; also *Bhagvad-Gitá*.

† *Bhagvad-Gitá*.

‡ *Bhagvad-Gitá*.

layas. The one is minor (*mánwantarika*), the other is major (*kálpika*). The first, according to the theory, destroys only the three worlds—*Bhur*, *Bhuvar*, *Swar** (i. e. the universe up to the solar regions), the second destroys all the six—the three just mentioned, and *Mahar*, *Jana*, *Tapas* (the whole of the universe), the seventh (*Satya* or *Brahma* i. e. the universe in a state of equilibrium—in the ethereal condition—the Indestructible Ens, the great Potentiality) † alone subsisting. Fresh creation, after this *mahá-pralaya*, begins with *Vách* (the word i. e. differentiation, spontanious generation)‡, which calls into being *Iśwar* (the reflection of *chit* into *śuddha-sattwá-prakrti*) a centre of energy whence the whole evolves as explained in sect. IV. We have also seen that at every fresh evolution, the universe comes into being from the potentialities (*sanskáras*) inherited from the previous universe, so to speak §; in other words, evolution starts from the stage where it stopped. Evolution begins and works on the *same* lines as before, only on a *higher*, or rather *different*, plane. What holds true of the *kálpika* cycle, holds true of the *mánwantarika* cycle and the *yugas*. Thus it is,

---

* *Taittiriyopaniśad*

† To the two pralayas add a third, called *nityapralaya*, daily suspension (of mental, creation) i. e sleep Thus sleep is cosmic suspension, dream is *mánwantarika* suspension, and waking is creation In all three it is the *idea*, the mental creation, that makes the difference · hence the theory of several ancient religious philosophies that the world is an *idea* of the great mind, the Demiurgos All creation begins in the *idea* of the Eternal i e. in *Vách* (the word, the idea) of *Brahma*

‡ Whence *Brahma* is called *Śabda-Brahma* the *Brahma* in its potentiality ; the cosmic embryo.

§ *Krsna* in the *Bhagwad-Gitá* applies this to the individual as also to the cosmos ch. VI.

at once, plain why Indian Astronomy does not divide time further than a *kalpa*. It calls the universe pre-eminently a *chakra*, a circle, and represents it in the *pauránika* symbology by the endless coil of the *ananta*. Now let us see what part the *monad* or individual (*jiva*) plays in this evolution; for it will then be clear to us what is meant by *moksha*, by return to nature, in its proper logical intention. We know that the sun is the centre of the system of which our earth is a member. The *Advaita* philosophy adds that he is the reservoir of the *prána* of the whole, and that the moon is the regulator or nourisher of this *prána*. Both are full of *prána*, but the *prána* of the sun is positive, that of the moon is negative. When death destroys any particular organism, it is only the *stuladeha* that is really dissolved, whereas the *lingadeda* (the 5 *pránas* + 10 organs of perception and action + *manas* and *buddhi*) survives, and, according as it falls in one current or the other, is carried to the sun or the moon*. If it passes into the current of positive *prána*, and gains the region of the sun, it does not return; if it passes into the negative current and gains the regions of the moon it has to return—the moon being within the atmosphere of the earth. The word return, in either case, implies a comparatively sooner or later return to the earth; and no-return, therefore, does not mean absolute extinction, annihilation, or permanent stay, for the *Advaita* is fully conscious of the indestructibility of matter, and the conservation of energy. The *lingadeha*, when it is time for it to return, passes through the vital current, and finds its way to the proper *sthula-deha*, through the particles of nourishment etc, which tend to form it. Nor should this surprise us, for the *lingadeha* is capable of being contained in the form of those invisible

* *Chhándogya ch. 5, sect. 10, also Brhadárnyaka ch. 8.*

animated germs*, so to speak, which ever pass and repass between the sun and moon and the earth and other planets This has been fully explained and discussed before

Thus, then, deaths are of two kinds lunar or solar All ordinary deaths are lunar, the death of organism in a higher state of developement are solar It will be remembered that at the end of a *manvantara*, the universe is dissolved up to the sun The present *manvantara* is called the *Vaivasvata manvantara*—the *manvantara* of *Vivasvat*, the sun We depend in this cycle for our *prána* and being, on the sun which we see but in the next *manvantara* this very sun will perhaps stand only as a planet to some other sun†, or be dissolved into a new sun or star The *Puránas* enumerate all these astronomical facts of succeeding *manvantaras* with poetical detail The whole of the solar system will thus be a fresh creation in the new *manvantara* Similarly the whole of the Universe with the solar systems will be created a fresh at the end of a *kalpa* Thus when *Adwaitism* says that solar death is *moksa*, it should be understood to mean that it is a state of *being* whence there is no return to the earth for one *manvantara* at least Solar death or *manvantarika* death is *moksa*, though only comparative and the *Vedántas* always praise *the way to the Sun* as the highest form of absolution This plainly for two reasons First because the solar being will not be born on earth but will, most probably pass on in its higher stages of developement to other planets

* Compare the illustration of the Bun an tree and its seed the latter containing the former —*Chh i dogya* chp VI sect 12 Also the reference to the mustard seed in St Mathews in the Bible

† Nor is this impossible for the whole of our solar system is known to be drifting though imperceptibly towards the Pleiades

or suns in the infinite cosmos; and secondly because in the ethereal spheres above, the planetary or solar-being will acquire capacities for action and knowledge, entirely beyond our conception. The existence in the ethereal regions is described as *svarga* (Heaven) in *pauranika* mythology, whence it appears that it is a kind of existence entirely subjective, at least free from those obstructions which our objective life necessarily submits us to. It is there that the planetary-being (*deva*-the effulgent; the *taijasa* of the *lingadeha*) has all its senses in, what we call, abnormal state of development, and memory also, the loss whereof is the main objection to the theory of the plurality of existences, is fully awake. Thus on account of this double advantage, passage to the sun is *mokśa*, as compared with passage to the moon, which is no *mokśa*; for from thence the lunar-being, though endowed with all the powers of the solar-being, has to return in a very short time to the earth. The attachment to the earth and its environments must have been sufficiently annulled to neutralise the force of attraction, and allow the being to pass into other higher states of existence which are open only to those who pass to the sun. The way to the sun, the way of real *mokśa*, is, therefore, variously described as the *Deva-yána* (the way of the *devas*, solar-beings) the *Archi-márga* (the way of light) *; as opposed to the *Pitṛ-yána* (the way of the *pitṛs*, manes, lunar beings who shortly return for fresh development), the *Dhuma-márga* (the smoky way, being as it were dark with the smoke of the sacrifices etc., performed by those who rely not on *dnána* but *kriyá* alone) †. Thus solar

* The way accessible to the followers of *Dnána* as opposed to *Kriyá* or formalism whose way is *smoke*.

† Vide *Brahma Sutras* Bk. *IV*; the *Chhándogya* ch. 5; and the *Brihadáranyaka* ch. 8; and the *Bh-Gitá* ch. 8.

and lunar deaths produce different conditions of existence in different states of development, and keep the monad for a longer or shorter period in that state But there is yet a third kind of death—the death of those whose capacity carries them even beyond the sun This is *Brahmila* death—death of the real knower of *Brahma*, the Great Unity One who "passes this life in the *Brahmila* condition becomes *Brahma**" The being remains in perfect bliss till the end, not of a *manvantara*, but a *kalpa*, after which it will be re produced, only on an extremely higher stage of development—probably as the centre of some system of planets (a sun the beginner of a fresh world and a fresh *manvantara*) or as some grander centre of force (*Isvara*) Real *moksa* is possible only to those who die the *manvantrila* or *Brahmila* death and thus pass onwards through the sun To secure therefore, the proper current of *prana* at the time of passing this life, *Adwaitins* pursue the course indicated by Patanjali for the regulation of breath &c which however, it is not our purpose to go into The point is to establish or rather realise the unity of *pinda* and *brahmanda* and leave evolution to itself The monad or *jiva* will continue to develop in this manner, but it can be free from the sense of separateness, from evil at any moment, and on the tenacity of this conviction of non separateness will depend all its progress

This tenaceous conviction of non separateness is the highest *samadhi*, trance abstraction, the aim of all *yoga* It is called *Rajayoga* or *Asparsayoga* as distinguished from *Hathayoga* or *Sparsayoga* *Hathayoga* proceeds to lay down certain rules for the regulation of the *prana*† by

---

* The *Bhagavad Gita* ch II 72

† *Ha*=the sun *tha*=the moon hence *Hathayoga*=the science of regulating the sun and moon *pranas* of the *pinda*

several severe practices, and goes on the supposition that regulation of the breath will regulate the *antahkarana*, and keep it at rest—a condition necessary for true natural development The other—*Rájayoga*—begins at the other end, and proceeds to lay down certain rules quite on the subjective side which being governed, the proper *práṇa* will follow of itself. This is *Asparśayoga*;—the *yoga* to which nothing touches, i.e. which does not allow the monad to be affected by the consequences of its *kriyamáṇa*. The other is *Sparśayoga* which does allow the monad to be involved, if unwary, in the various supernatural, so to speak, powers (*siddhis*) which, it acquires by the way. Hence all books on the *Advaita* and especially the *Gitá*, the very esoteric truth of whose words is beyond the grasp of many, lay down that one should always try to follow the course of *Rájayoga*, by controlling, and regulating, the *antahkaraṇa* "slowly and slowly by the light of *dnána*, ever persevering, and resolving the mind into the *A'tman**." "It is indeed the *mind*, that is the cause of *bandha* or *moksha*†," for in the nature of things the one or the other does not exist. This, however, does not mean that one should renounce all responsibility, and deceive oneself into the belief of having obtained real *áparoksha-dnána*, for "not an atom stands even for a moment,—without *doing* something‡" and every being has to fulfil, to the best of its powers, the duties incumbent to its position. One should never shrink from duty, for none, in the course of nature, can so free oneself as ever to be at rest. Every one has to work his own development, not by pessimism, but by active self-sacrificing work—the very law of being. All

* The *Bhagvad-Gitá*.
† The *Panchadaśi*.
‡ The *Bhagvad-Gitá*.

that is possible for acquiring higher development (*moksa*) is but the practice of the said *Rajayoga*, i e freeing oneself from the *individualising* (*chitta*) and *egoing* (*ahankára*) parts of ones subjective nature Several superficial inquirers often understand that *Advaitism* inculcates a hedonistic code of ethics, and makes the individual perfectly irresponsible for 'the senses find their own objects and play with them, the ego which is pure bliss, is never affected by their acts'* It will be plain to all careful thinkers that the code of *Advaita* ethics is strictly one of work, unflinching honest work, that the individual is as much responsible for its own development as it possibly can be, and that true *dnána* which is neither indolent Stoicism nor irresponsible Epicureanism, consists in the practice of that *yoga* which is called *Rájayoga*—the freeing oneself from being involved in the *consequences* of acts done *Prárabdha* will work itself out, but the *being* will be free from its effects will lay up no *sanchita* it having destroyed itself Even *Sannyása* the mere withdrwal from active life is held up to ridicule for "true *Sannyása* is entire devotion to *without being involved* in the consequence of the duties of ones position in Nature † Where is the use of indolently throwing off those responsibilities which every individual has to fulfil, as long as it is an *individual*—as long as the *pinda* is not in harmony with the *brahmanda* Mere physical abandoning of ones duties is no *Sannyása* at all Objective development must be accompanied by subjective development both are inseparable If the aspirant to *aparoksha Brahmadnána* has understood his position, he will easily know where to read in tangible figures, the

* These words occur in the *Bhagvad Gita* and are often wrongly understood

† *Bhagvad Gita* Ch 18 Verse 1

actual point at which his subjective thermometre stands. It is on the objective tablet of the *práṇa* of his organism, the nature, course, and position of which, in the case of the individual who is enlightened, must correspond to its nature, course, and position in the Great Individual—the Great Unity, the Cosmos. All breach of this Unity, both subjective as well as objective, is evil, and leads to misery. True bliss—*mokṡa*—lies in annihilating the self; "Guard Self aginst Self, for Self is the greatest friend and the greatest enemy of Self."*

This state of *jivanmukti* or *mokṡa* or *dnána* is the *Turyá*—the fourth state. It is *Brahma* wherein there is no individuality. It corresponds to sleep, but it is a *waking sleep* as explained before. One who is in the *turyá* does never sleep, nor dream, nor stand awake.† The individual has destroyed itself,

has dissolved itself in *the* Individual, "like salt in the ocean of which it is only another form*." So then, real *moksha* consists in that *dnána* which leads to the recognition of the Unity of *pinda* and *brahmánda*, the Unity of the individual and the cosmos,—the Unity of Nature, *Brahma*. Let the *jiva* meditate tenaciously on this unity and he will become it, he will lose himself in it "*He* will be *It*," even as the worm thinking of the bee, and ultimately developing itself into one.

It may, at first sight, appear that this ideal of happiness—which, by the way, is nowadays the acknowledged ethical standard—is highly selfish. It is, however, only necessary to bear in mind that though this philosophy accepts the highest possible kind of utility as its ethical standard, it is not at all selfish in its code of morals. It enjoins, as we have seen, unflinching devotion to duty, and preaches at the same time the supreme Gospel of Unity—non-separateness. This combination of Duty and Unity, a circle within a circle, results in the submission of the individual to the working of its objective development, without subjectively being involved in it. To secure this subjective condition of Unity, the short sweet and sublime precept this philosophy gives is—All is Self—all is *Atman*, *love all as you love yourself*. It preaches not universal *brotherhood*, but universal *love*, universal *Unity*. Love your neighbour, not

---

is true to-day is false to-morrow, it is changing, and admits of any expla-
nation and arrangement. Not only this but even the way of its origin as
well as the origin itself, is all shrouded in the deepest mystery. *Jagat*
therefore is hardly other than *Svapna*. Thus *Advaitism* regards nature *always*
from individual experience and believes *moksha* to lie in nothing but in the
recognition of the unity of *pinda* and *brahmánda*.

* *Chhandogya* ch. VI also *Brihadaranyaka* ch. IV

as your *brother*, but as *yourself* *. *It is* the Religion of Love: love, not based on mere emotional sentiments *of the heart*,—to which many doctors and divines appeal in their attempts to demonstrate the necessity of religion; but on a plain honest recognition of that Unity which is the rational, and therefore, permanent, essence of the sentiment†. Initiation in the barest principles of the *Advaita* is forbidden to one who has not subjugated his *self*, has not learnt the first principles of this rational Universal Love. Even the four *A'śramas*—stations or stages of life—are but mere preliminaries to this end,—the last *A'śrama*. Woman is, in the *A'ryan* creed, the embodiment of pure *Love*; she is to be worshipped‡ as the initiator and teacher of man in Love; man is not to retire into the last *A'śrama*—*dnána*—without having received proper tuition in the preliminary *áśrama*—love—married life. The *Virága* which the *Advaita* requires as a first qualification in the candidate for *dnána*, is not mere indifference, mere Stoical apathy; it is *vi* (destruction of) *rág* (attachment, individuality, the property of *Rajas*),— the destruction of the sense of separateness, the recognition of that unification which leaves no room for being attached to any individuality, and establishes the sense of Universal Love True *rági* (lover) is none but the *virági* (no-lover) True *virága* never arises

---

* Even the commonest books on morals say "he only sees who sees all beings as his *self*"—*Hitopadeśa*.

† *It may be remarked that by leaving out* the rational side of this religion of love, from which Arabian and Persian *Sufism has largely* borrowed, that it has dwindled into a religion of carnal enjoyment. It can however not be denied that the higher side is amply represented in the odes of *Hafiz and a few other* writers of his turn of mind; but these are rather the exception than the rule

‡ *Manu* Ch. IX. also *Yájnavalkya*, *Atri*, *Daksa* etc.

but from true *discrimination*, the understanding of the nature and laws of *prakrti* and *chit*, *Átmán* and *Anátman*—the real and the unreal. This is called *viveka*. *Viveka* and *virága* are followed by a stage consisting of six steps* which thoroughly prepare the candidate, for initiation into the secret of Unity—*Advaita*—Universal Love. After he has acquired these qualifications he becomes a *mumukshu*, one desirous of *moksha*; it is then that by *Sravana* (constant study), *Manana* (careful digestion of the principles acquired from study), and *Nididhyásana* (realising in practice the truth of what is thus acquired), he attains to that identification, both subjective and objective, with the cosmos—*Brahma*—wherein he continues to develop in perfect bliss.

How can this theory of pure, active, universal, love be called selfish? That it is pessimistic in an opinion not worth entertaining after what we have said But if it is not Pessimistic nor Hedonitic, it is not even Optimistic or Altruistic, in the vagueness of meaning attached to the words. It is Altruistic in so far as it recognises universal love—Unity—as its aim and object, it is highly Utilitarian in so far as it rationally demonstrates that very fact of Unity to be the Happiness—the *paramánanda*, supreme joy, bliss,—proper to man. The vagueness that attaches itself to all moral theories, in vogue at present, has its source in the method followed by them. The general practice is to sever religion from ethics, and base the latter entirely on a foundation of experience. As in physics, so in ethics, experience, no doubt, is the basis of thought, but

* *Sama* (subjugation of the mind and its creations), 2, *Dama* (subjugation of the body along with the mind), 3, *Uparama* (destruction of the sense of separateness, i. e. desire, formalism &c.), 4, *Titiksha* (entire surrender to the laws of Nature), 5, *Śraddhá* (confidence in science and nature), 6, *Samádhána* (reconciliation to ones place in Nature).

a true estimate of the end of life, of the aim of existence, can never be understood without a proper appreciation of these facts which religion, at least religion or philosophy in the *Advaita* sense, supplies. Religion, rather philosophy, must combine with science, be guided by it, and lead to a rational code of metaphysics and ethics, which should be a sure, certain, veritable, guide to man, by explaining to him his real position in nature. The true religion is the religion of *dnâna*, the religion of science, in fact a combination of science and philosophy—*Advaitism*. All happiness arises from *dnâna*; *dnâna* is bliss; *adnâna* is misery; in the grand *Advaita* there is no *dnâna*, and no *adnâna*, all being perfect order and perfect harmony. *Thought* (*chit*) is *being* (*sat*), and there being no evil, all is bliss (*ânanda*)· *sat-chit-ânanda*

We have seen, then, that the final bliss of the *Advaita* consists, not in mere cessation of pain by the *grace* of God, as the *naiyâyikas* and *vaiśeśikas* maintain; nor in the Heaven of the *mimânsakas*; nor even in the tranquility of *samâdhi* secured by the favour of *Iśvra*, as Patanjali holds; nor lastly in the recognition by *puruśa* of the *sâttrikà* side of *prakṛti*, as the *sânkhyas* put it,* but only in that true recognition of the Unity of Nature in which there is no diversity and no evil—in *dnâna*, knowledge and knowledge alone †. The *mokśa* of the *Advaita* is the

law of nature, *vastugati* as they call it; not a thing to be acquired, nor a state to be produced. It is a law which fulfils itself even in spite of the individual. The recognition of this unity is the highest *samâdhi*; for, to one in *kaivalya* "there is *samâdhi* at every point of the mind's cognition*." True happiness results from recognition of this fact, from *knowledge*—*dnâna*. It is *kaivalya*, Unity of all Thought and all Being.

VII. CONCLUSION.

"He *knows*, who does *not know*; he who *knows* does *not know*. *It is unknown* to the *knowing*, and is *known* to the *not-knowing*."—*Kenopanis'ad.*

"I reveal *myself* in whatever form the worshipper worships me; men, indeed, in every way, follow *my* path."—*Bhagvad-Gîtâ.*

"As water fallen from the cloud finds its way to the ocean, so even does homage done to *any* god always reach the Supreme"—*Bhâgvata-Purâna.*

We have taken a cursory view of the principal facts of *Advaitism*, and arrived at the end of our inquiry. *Advaitism is*, as we have seen, a philosophy with *Brahma* its God, self-sacrificing *Prema*—love—its law, and *Dnâna* its end and aim. It is pre-eminently the religion of Unity—*Love. The points wherein Advaitism* resembles Monism must not have escaped the attention of the careful reader. In the first place, both are at one in dispensing with all *theories of final causes*, and in substituting instead,

is *Kaivalya* one-ness, non-separateness, unity. Even in *dnâna*—the *moksa* of the *Advaita*—there are seven stages; *S'ubhechhâ* (the *four* preliminary

(the *Kaivalya*)

* *Drgdrśyaviveka.*

a theory of efficient causes sufficient, in themselves, to account for every thing in a perfectly machanical manner. Everything is as it ought to be, and will be as it should be, there is none to pre-arrange or interfere with any, the smallest, item of this uniform, endless, and self-working, wheel of Nature. In the next place, the two philosophies *are again unanimous* in maintaining the inseparability of mind and matter, and the *consequent* unity of nature. The distinction between organic and inorganic nature is held by both to be nil, and the unity of nature is pronounced to be perfect and complete.

Advaitism extends the principle which monism applies on a smaller scale—the ontogeny and philogeny of organisms—and asserts the unity of the microcosm and the macrocosm, declaring —as within so without. Further, in furtherance of this application of the law of individual and cosmic unity, *Advaitism* analyses all organisms into their constituents,—the three physical *dehas*, and the five psychological *Kośas.** Both monism and *Advaitism* are true advocates of development in its widest sense. *Advaitism* admitting the descent of man from *lower types* seeks *for* his *nearest ancester in the lion*; and maintains, in faithfully carrying out evolution to its logical *consequences*, the *theory of transmigration* in its widest sense. In its theory of cosmic activity and rest (*kalpa*

* The French school of anthropologists, though opposing the theory of *the transmutability of species*, and maintaining, therefore, the distinction between *organic and inorganic* nature, lays down something quite similar to the three *dehas and five kośas.* The human body is divided by Barthez, *Lordat, and others of the Medical school of Montpellier, into the material substance*, the *vital force*, and the *intimate sense*; the first pertaining to the gross mineral kingdom subject to gravitation *and etherodynamy*; the second and third to the higher animal *kingdom showing* vitality, sensation, and volition. Add to this our *manod with its dnanamaya-kośa* and the series will be complete.

and *pralaya*), and of the descents (*avatáras*) of the Supreme, it enunciates the main conclusions of monism and science in general. Again, it shows full consciousness of the laws of Inheritance and Adaptation, in its theory of *prárabdha* and *kriyamána*; in explaining which, it makes room for the free will of man, if free it can be called, and postulates, in accordance with its highly developed theory of evolution, certain modifications in the action of the law of heridity. It demonstrates, from the insufficiency of mere heridity to account for all the facts of mental and physical development, the necessity of assuming the survival of the *lingadeha*, and thus makes every being responsible, not only for the better evolution of the human race in general, but also for the evolution of his own individual self in particular. In futher explaining the origin of evil and the nature of bliss or happiness, it lays down that evil as such does not exist in the great Unity—Nature. It is all *a creation of individuality*—it is *identical* with *individuality*. True happiness consists in nothing but *dnána*—the recognition of the Unity of the individual and the cosmos,—*Brahma*. In describing the details of this theory of *moksa*, it explains how the *lingadeha* travels through the ethereal regions, and seeks its *true place in nature*. It explains the importance of the sun and the moon in their influence on organisms, and shows the connection they have with the development of the *lingadeha* of beings. The *moksa* of *Advaitism* is purely scientific, and the ethical code it preaches in accordace with *it*, is, therefore, a grand law of rational Unity—love; that love which knows no individuality, and melts the whole in One Self.

These few facts plainly show that *Advaitism* had in ages past fully grasped the principles of evolution, and had

carried them to their scientific and logical conclusion. Modern science in developing the theory of evolution is, perhaps, gradually arriving at the very same conclusions, and the past but repeats itself in the present. This is as it ought to be in the great circle of the Unity of Nature.

The *Advaita* is the real God of Indian or *A'ryan* monotheism—the God whom man as man should recognise and offer worship. That God who rules the destiny of His creatures in an arbitrary manner is a mere fetish, sufficient to satisfy the animal part of man; but his human better self ever seeks for a higher life, and finds it in that *sacrifice* wherein *it destroys itself*—recognises the Unity of Nature, of subject and object, of self and *Brahma*. We thus see how *A'ryan* monotheism differs from Semitic monotheism; and understand why the real human God *must* be none other than *Brahma*. This splendid achievement of the *A'ryan* intellect is a result of the combination of religion and science; and reads a very important lesson to religionists and scientists alike. True science is religion, and true religion is science—Monism or *Advaitism*.

This highly philosophical and scientific religion is the firm rock on which Indian society is based; and all the fantastic *paurāṇika* myths, all the ridiculous ceremonies and rites, all the most uncivilized superstitions and customs, are all but projections, sometimes deformed, sometimes distorted, but ever solid, of an edifice which derives support from this foundation. The Indian *A'rya* lives and moves in *Advaitism*, nay the very atmosphere he breathes is impregnated with the invigorating scent of this religio-scientific philosophy. Whereas Monism is yet knocking at the gates of the European world, *Advaitism* is already a part and parcel

of the very being of Indian society. It has taken us so many pages to describe the elements of this philosophy, but the shortest creed which every true *A'rya* has on his lips is the celebrated hemistich of the great teacher S'ankara " Unity (*Brahma*) is the Truth, names and forms (*jagat*) are unreal, the Individual (*jiva*) is the Unit." The true *A'rya* is not an *individual* like his brother of the West, but the Individual—*Brahma*. Is it not, then important for every Hindu, and every critic of his life, manners, and ways of thought, to understand what lies at the root of his being,and understand the why and wherefore of his *place inNature*? Is this search not renderd necessary after we have seen that *Advaitism* is but another, perhaps more developed, form of what the illustrious discoveries of the nineteenth century call Monism? And is the inquiry not rendered a thousand-fold more imperative when we see that *Advaitism* starting from the same premises as Monism lays before us certain logical conclusions, yet to be investigated and established by Monism,—conclusions which concern the nearest well-being of every individual in particular, and humanity in general? *Advaitism* ceases to interest us as a mere historical relic of religious phrenzy, as a mere curiosity worth the attention of antiquarians; and demands our attention as a scientific demonstration of truths, the common property and well-being of the world. *Advaitism* and Monism promise, thus, to blend into that Unity which they both singly preach in the land of their respective birth; and bring about that grand Unity in which the East and West—all humanity, or, if we choose, all *being*—will stand *one* in eternal Love and Bliss.

NOTE.

(page 68.)

India has been a strong point of attraction to the ambition of foreign nations, since about *the beginning of the fourth century before* Christ. The successive incursions of Persians, Macedonians, Bactrians, Scythians (the *Turuśkas* and *Śakas* of the *Purâṇas*, and the *Sacæ* of the Greeks), produced a period of unprecedented unsettlement and disquiet in the land, convulsing all order—religious, social, political. The Mahomedans, and the Moguls too, with a few honourable exceptions, gave the last benumbing blow to the tottering spirit of *A'ryâvarta*, and laid it low in the lap of eternal oblivion. There were signs of revival, some glimmerings of light, under rulers like Vikrama, Bhoja, Bukka, and teachers like S'ankara, Kumârila, Sâyaṇa; but these were of a short duration, and were so far dissociated from the original source, as not to be able to establish a sufficiently uniform thread of connection between the *past* and the *present*. Though the whole of our dramatic literature, nay the very *Mahâbhâṣyas* of the four *Vedas*, and various works on *nyâya, vedânta, mimânsa*, astrology, medicine, and other cognate subjects, are results of this fit of literary activity, the religio-scientific *Darśanas*, the very life-blood of the nation, are, in this very period, charged with an amount of foreign matter which completely defiled them, and produced those enormous excrescencies—the *Purâṇas*. The *Purâṇas* are a mixture of the *Vedas*, the *Darśanas*, the heretical doctrines of Buddha and Jina, coeval literature, and above all exploits of fabulous and historical heroes—the *avatâras*; all shrouded under an impenetrable veil of poetical exaggeration intended to catch the vulgar imagination, and satisfy the popular instinct for religion; suggesting, at the same time, to the intelligent, the old doctrine of the Truth. In the imbecility of physical and mental vigour, subsequent upon the said political, and, therefore, social and religious convulsions,

the *Aryans* replaced the old doctrine of *Karma action*, by the doctrine of *Prasáda, grace* Not that this idea was entirely new but it was brought to the front by the *Puránas* whose main tuition, is all that way In fact, it is the very essence of the *Purána* We have seen that the rational as well as the mythical proceed hand in hand As the old rational theory of *Karma* gave way to the new mythical theory of *Prasáda*, it became necessary to impress on the latter the stamp of rationalism to make it current among a nation imbued with hereditary rationality To this attempt at rationalising the doctrine of *grace*, we owe the two systems which bear the name of the *Advaita*, not of the ancient *Kaivalya* (monistic) school, but of the new *Visistha* (qualified) and *Visuddha* (purified) school respectively The leader of the one is Râmânuja who lived in the 12th century, and of the other Vallabha who lived in the 16th *Moksa* is possible only by *Bhakti* and *Prasáda* (devotion and grace) and not, as of old, by *Dnána* and *Karma* Râmânuja holds that the *Advaita* as understood is not the proper intention of the *Upanisadu Advaita—Brahma* True that the Whole is one uniform *Brahma* but within *Brahma* are two other divisions—*jada* and *jiva—which can never be one with Brahma or with each other* Inorganic and organic nature is ever separate though part and parcel of the One cause of all—*Brahma Brahma* is not the instrumental as well as material cause of the universe, but the instrumental cause only, the material being his two other subordinates organic and inorganic matter—*jiva* and *jada* Thus though there is one *Brahma* that *Brahma* is to be understood in this threefold aspect—*chit (jiva) achit (jada)* and *Hari (Brahma)*—i e in this *qualified* (*visistha*) sense Whereas Ramanuja only *qualified* the original *Advaita*, Vallabha who was preceded in the same line of investigation by Nimbarka and Visnuswamin thought of *purifying* (*visuddha*) it alto-

OTHER WORKS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

*** Can be had on application to the author, or to any of the following :—

Pandita Jyestârâma Mukundaji.. —— Dámodardás Ishvardás	Bookseller, Kálkádevi-Road, Bombay.

VERNACULAR PUBLICATIONS

Śiksa Sataka—a hundred didactic pieces of poetry [Out of print

Malati Mádhava translation of the Sanskrt of Bhavabhuti with copious notes [Price Rs 1 8 0

Uttara Rama Charita translation of the Sanskrt of Bhavabhuti with copious notes [Price Rs 1-0 0

" Very careful translations worthy of serving as models to all subsequent workers in the same line —Translation of extracts from the Gujaráta School paper

Kantá an original drama, based on an episode in the ancient history of Gujaráta [Price Rs 0 8 0

" We admire the high powers of the writer —The Gujaráti

" We congratulate Mr Manilal for taking the lead in performing a service which our vernacular expects long since from our graduates We are very much pleased with the pure and refined poetical taste of a very superior order displayed by the author who possesses we are convinced a natural aptitude for such work —Translation of an extract from the Gujaráta School paper

" The only play worthy of the name in our vernacular Full of poetical genius of a very superior class and perfectly charming" —Translation of extracts from the Buddhi prakása

Purva Darśana an outline of Indian History up to 1761 [Out of print

Nari pratistha an essay on the nature, position, and rights of women. [Price Rs 0-8-0

Prema-Jivana eleven poetical pieces on the philosophy of the *Vedánta*, with critical notes [given gratis

Prana Vinimaya a manual practically demonstrating the existence of the Psychic force in nature [Price Rs 3 0 0

Mr Dvivedi has prepared this little volume in his zeal to arrive at the Truth, and we are sure no scholar in our midst would have done the justice he has been able to do to the subject from his vast reading and personal experience —*Translation of an extract from the Gujarati*

Priyamvada, Vol IV a critical social and literary monthly magazine. [Yearly subscription Rs 1 3 0

" It is useless to say that it is good after saying that it is edited by Prof *Dvivedi* —The Gujaráta School paper

IN PREPARATION

**The Bhagvad Gitá* text with various readings etc, a literal translation, with commentary based on the *Bhásya* of Sankara, and the *Tikás* of Madhusudana, Anandagiri, Sridhara, Sankarananda, Sadananda, also the *Bhásyas* of Ramanuja, Vallabha, and Ananda tirtha, and annotations to explain the *esoteric* meaning of the poem

Kavya Mayukha a work on Indian Poetics based on the works of Mammata Jagannath, Visvanatha *Dhananjaya*, *Bhoja*, Vag bhatta, Vamana, Rudrata, Abhinavagupta, Jayadeva and Appaya Dixita with illustrations &c

* *Sadvrtti* a book on character, based on the plan of Smiles Character

* *Gulabasinha* a mystical novel, on the plan of Lord Lyttens Zanoni

* These are being published in monthly parts in Priyamvadá